DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 988 JC 880 414

AUTHOR Alkin, Marvin C.; Freeman, Marie
TITLE Highlights of EOPS Programs: 1987-88 Operational Program Reviews.
INSTITUTION Education Evaluation Associates, Northridge, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Sep 88
NOTE 83p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Educational Counseling; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Evaluation Methods; *Outreach Programs; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Extended Opportunity Programs and Services

ABSTRACT

Drawing from on-site evaluations of the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) operating at 22 California community colleges in 1987-88, this report assesses the programs with respect to management, outreach and recruitment, instructional development, counseling, transfer and transition, special activities, financial aid, and staff development and training. Chapter 1 describes the process used to evaluate the 22 programs, identifies primary sources of information, and offers a profile of EOPS students in 1984-85 through 1987-88. Chapter 2 presents a survey of the EOPS services, noting exemplary activities. Highlighted findings include the following: (1) all of the programs distributed financial aid, but the amount of the aid, the form in which it was distributed, and the timing of the distributions differed considerably by college; (2) half of the programs were managed by a full-time director or coordinator; (3) all 22 programs were involved in outreach and recruitment efforts in their local service areas; (4) in cases in which the EOPS programs funded a portion of the total costs of the colleges' tutoring services, additional tutoring services beyond the level normally provided to other students were available to EOPS students; and (5) counseling services to facilitate transfer to four-year colleges were provided by most schools. Chapter 3 offers a summary of the recommendations for program improvement resulting from the evaluation. Appendixes provide a list of the programs reviewed in 1987-88, guidelines on operational program review procedures, and statistics on the characteristics and goals of the EOPS student populations in 1984-85 through 1987-88. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298988

HIGHLIGHTS OF EOPS PROGRAMS

1987-88 OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEWS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Sukstorf

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EEA Educational Evaluation Associates
9230 Jellico Avenue
Northridge, CA 91325

JC 880 414

EOPS Operational Program Review

1987-88 Annual Report

Prepared by

Marvin C. Alkin
Marie Freeman

September 1988

Prepared for the Chancellor's Office,
California Community Colleges

Presented to

Ron Dyste
Vice Chancellor
Student Services &
Special Programs

Rod Tarrer
Coordinator for the
Administration of EOPS

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....1

Chapter 1: Introduction.....4

Chapter 2: EOPS Services and Exemplary Activities.....12

Chapter 3: Summary of the 1987-88 OPR Recommendations.....34

Appendix A: EOPS Programs Reviewed in 1987-88.....00

Appendix B: Operational Program Review Procedures (Abbreviated).....00

Appendix C: Student Demographic Data, Educational Goals, and High School Graduation Status of the 1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87, and 1987-88 EOPS Student Populations.....00

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents an overview of the EOPS Operational Program Reviews conducted at 22 community colleges in 1987-88. It sets findings about programs strengths and weaknesses in the context of eight EOPS program components: management, outreach and recruitment, instructional development, counseling, transfer and transition, special activities, financial aid, and staff development and training. The report also provides summary four-year data on EOPS student characteristics.

The 1986-87 EOPS Operational Program Reviews were conducted between September, 1987 and April, 1988. Collectively, these reviews drew data from questionnaires returned by 447 faculty and staff and 433 students. In addition, there were a total of 734 detailed interviews with faculty and staff and 239 interviews with students. Student demographic data collected as a part of the reviews are presented in the body of the report.

Among the programs reviewed, there were a number of similarities. All programs distributed financial aid, but the amount of the aid, the form in which it was distributed, and the timing of the distributions differed considerably. Every program included some personnel who provided encouragement and advisement to EOPS students and who monitored academic status. Responsibility for recruiting the appropriate target populations was also recognized by every program under review, and each program had a program plan which described projected activities in several service component areas. The number of particular services provided by individual programs, their quality, and the adequacy of their descriptions in the plans differed widely. New Title 5 regulations became effective in October, 1987, and OPR teams found great variance in the level of implementation of these regulations from program to program.

- Management. Half of the EOPS programs are managed by a director or coordinator, and half of the directors held dual roles in the college. Those program which the OPR teams found to be generally most effective had administrative role clarity, with program activities well-integrated among themselves and well

coordinated with other campus services. About 40 percent of the total recommendations were related to management, even though several programs were exceptionally well managed and required no recommendations in this area. The most prevalent recommendations related to non-compliance with Title 5 guidelines: failure to meet the state requirements for "over and above" services and failure to have an Advisory Committee. Numerous colleges received recommendations related to general program administrative issues such as organizational structure, role responsibilities, staff communication, office space and EOPS image. Also, many OPR recommendations dealt with an EOPS program plan's failure to accurately describe activities and staff assignments. (See pp. 12-16; 35-38)

•Outreach and Recruitment. EOPS programs maintain outreach and recruitment efforts in their local service areas as part of an overall goal of encouraging students who might not otherwise consider college as an option. As a natural follow-through to outreach and recruitment, many EOPS programs also provide orientation activities for students once they arrive at the college so that students may become familiar with campus facilities, registration and financial aid procedures. OPR teams found that programs vary considerably in the emphasis they place on outreach and recruitment. Team members made recommendations to 16 college programs directing them to develop or to improve a specific recruitment plan. Six colleges received recommendations which noted specific target populations which had not been adequately recruited. (See pp. 16-19; 40)

•Instructional Development and Services. EOPS programs offer direct instruction or instructional support for students not adequately prepared for college. This includes tutoring and special classes to improve study skills and personal development. Most colleges offer some form of tutoring to all of their students and, when appropriately structured, these activities provide EOPS students with tutoring services beyond the level normally provided to the rest of the college's students. The OPR teams made recommendations to 13 EOPS programs to improve instructional services. (See pp. 19-21; 40-41)

•Counseling. All EOPS programs offer some form of student counseling. These services are usually of three types: college information, academic planning and progress monitoring, and personal. Most programs have available a professional counselor who works only with EOPS students. In addition, several EOPS programs also have a group of peer advisors, students who act as friends and helpers. OPR reviewers found in 16 of the programs that counseling services needed improvement. The most common recommendations related to positions which did not provide "over and above" counseling services to EOPS students, problems meeting new Title 5 requirements for counseling contacts and incomplete student files. (See pp. 21-24; 41)

•Transition. EOPS offers activities to help students make a successful transition to four-year institutions, employment, or other post-college endeavors. In the majority of the schools reviewed during 1987-88, some kind of college transition services were provided by EOPS counselors during the course of regular counseling sessions. Employment transition activities were generally not systematically organized. Transition was perhaps the weakest of all components in the EOPS programs. In a number of instances, no unique EOPS transition component existed. (See pp. 24-26; 41)

- Special Activities. During 1987-88, OPR teams found three types of special activities: CARE (Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education) programs, EOPS-sponsored cultural activities, and use of consultants for such things as staff training, instructional design or evaluation. Typically, a CARE program operated almost as a separate entity within EOPS. There were only two recommendations for this component. (See pp. 26-27; 41-42)

- Financial Aid. Financial aid benefits are extended through direct grants, book stipends or loans, work study, meal tickets, and other sources. Many of the activities of this component required close cooperation between the EOPS program and the financial aid office. The nature of this cooperation and eligibility determination procedures were the focus of most recommendations within this component. Eight programs received a total of 18 recommendations in this area. Several colleges had not yet implemented Title 5 regulations concerning EOPS eligibility determination and financial aid packaging. (See pp. 27-30; 42)

- Staff Development and Training. These activities were included in a number of programs to improve the skills, knowledge, and experience of EOPS and college staff and faculty. In ten of the programs reviewed, OPR teams found deficiencies in the way in which staff development was conducted. There is a need for regular staff meetings and formal inservice training activities. Particular deficiencies were noted in staff development for college faculty and staff. (See pp. 30-31; 42)

The program components which encompass EOPS activities do not fully describe the essence of EOPS programs. Some aspects of EOPS do not neatly fit a budget category or planning component. A very important aspect of EOPS is the personal touch. The human elements which OPR teams observed serve to enrich the programs through the dedication, care and attention that staff members give to students and that students offer to one another. (See pp. 31-33)

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

This chapter briefly describes the Operational Program Review process used to examine 22 EOPS programs during the 1987-88 academic year (see Appendix A). The chapter also describes the main sources of information for the programs under review and presents a profile of students who participated in those programs.

What is EOPS?

Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), established in 1969 by the state legislature, is designed to provide low-income community college students with support services that will help them enroll and succeed in post-secondary education. Today, EOPS programs operate in all of California's community colleges. EOPS offers academic, counseling, and financial assistance through formally structured program components. In addition, the program offers the informal, personal contributions of EOPS staff and students, a system of support that often exerts the greatest impact on the lives of participating students.

What is an OPR?

Each year since 1983, the Chancellor's Office has selected a different group of EOPS programs for an on-site assessment. These Operational Program Reviews (OPRs) evaluate the implementation and overall effectiveness of the program. By the middle of the 1988-89 academic year, every EOPS program in the state will have undergone an OPR.

Each OPR is conducted by a team of three professionals: a qualitative evaluator, an EOPS director or administrator from another community college, and a representative of the Chancellor's Office. For some large programs the team consists of as many as six people. The teams analyze questionnaires, conduct interviews, make direct observa-

tions, and review documentation to corroborate findings. The purpose of the review is to determine the degree to which each program is implementing the elements of its program plan (including its intended outcomes) and the degree of satisfaction participants have with the program. At the conclusion of an OPR, the team members summarize their findings and develop a set of recommendations for program improvement. These are presented to the EOPS director and college administrators at an exit interview. A preliminary copy of the findings and recommendations is typed and sent to the college one week following the review, and a full written report usually follows within four to eight weeks.

Each individual on the OPR team contributes a unique perspective to the overall evaluation. Team Member A, an outside evaluator with special training in naturalistic observation and evaluation, coordinates the OPR and is responsible for conducting the qualitative component of the review. Team Member B is selected from the ranks of EOPS program directors and administrators to bring a practical, field-based point of view to the evaluation. Team Member C, a representative of the Chancellor's Office, adds technical knowledge of EOPS regulations. Although the OPR is conducted by a different team at each site, all teams follow the same basic procedures, guided by a set of evaluation field manuals. Each college's own EOPS program plan is the point of departure for the review. This assures that the OPR is tailored to the particular philosophy, objectives, staff, and student population of the EOPS program at that site.

An OPR, which requires a two-and-one-half day site visit, has two components. First, a highly structured Program Activity Review determines the extent to which objectives specified in the program plan have been achieved. Team Members B and C interview program staff and examine documentation as they compare the program plan's proposed activities and intended effects with actual accomplishments. They also identify any discrepancies which might exist between staff activities as outlined in the program plan and actual utilization of staff time.

Second, an open-ended qualitative evaluation, conducted by Team Member A, assesses the program's impact as perceived by the participants. This naturalistic assessment of program function is designed to evaluate the program as a whole from the point of view of student participants, EOPS staff, and college faculty and staff. Rather than focusing exclusively on activities specified in the program plan, Team Member A allows issues to emerge as people describe their own experiences, satisfactions, and concerns.

Data for the qualitative evaluation come from four sources: the EOPS program plan; confidential questionnaires completed prior to the site visit by EOPS students, program and college staff, and faculty; interviews with a broad sample of individuals who have knowledge of the program; and on-site observations. The interviews are directed toward the individuals' perceptions of how the EOPS program operates, how it affects them personally, and whether it does so in an appropriate and effective way. The evaluator also encourages suggestions for program improvement.

1987-88 OPRs

The Operational Program Reviews conducted in the fall of 1987 used colleges' 1986-87 EOPS program plans as the basis of evaluation because the 1987-88 plans were not yet approved by the state, and because the teams assumed that it could take some time to integrate new activities and staff into existing programs. The OPRs conducted in the winter and spring addressed the 1987-88 program plans, after new activities and personnel had become more fully operationalized. Regardless of which program plan was under review, the OPR teams sought to present their findings and recommendations so that compliance problems could be remedied immediately and steps could be taken to improve future program services. (A more thorough description of the Operational Program Review procedures is found in Appendix B.)

This annual report contains a synthesis of information from the individual OPR Summary Reports of the 22 EOPS programs reviewed between September, 1987, and

April, 1988. Collectively, the 22 OPR reports drew data from three sources: confidential questionnaires returned by 433 students and 477 faculty and staff; 734 detailed interviews with faculty and staff, and 239 interviews with students; and from direct observations of EOPS activities (see Table 1).

TABLE 1

Questionnaire and Interview Data Sources

1987-88 Operational Program Reviews

	Total: 22 Colleges	Average/ College
Questionnaires: Staff/Faculty	447	20
Questionnaires: Students	433	20
Interviews: Faculty/Staff	734*	33
Interviews: Students	239	11

*Many EOPS and college staff were interviewed by more than one OPR team member; this figure represents interviews rather than individuals.

EOPS Student Characteristics from 1987-88 OPRs

One objective of the OPRs is to provide the Chancellor's Office with descriptive information about EOPS students. The eligibility criteria for participation in EOPS are carefully specified by Title 5 regulations; consequently, one can assume that all EOPS students in 1987-88 shared certain characteristics. Beyond these common criteria of state residency, enrollment, educational disadvantage, and income, however, EOPS students in 1987-88 differed considerably. As part of the OPR process, EOPS directors

provided the following information about the students served: gender, age, ethnicity, educational goal, and high school graduation status. Tables 2, 3 and 4 present these descriptive data for the 1987-88 EOPS population as well as for those programs reviewed in 1986-87, 1985-86, and 1984-85.

TABLE 2

Student Demographic Data: 1984-85 Through 1987-88

	1984-85 (N=20 colleges)	1985-86 (N=29 colleges)	1986-87 (N=21 colleges)	1987-88 (N=21 colleges)	Cumulative Total (N=89 colleges)*
Total Students	7536	7948	8274	7228	29412
Gender					
Male	46%	44%	40%	39%	42%
Female	54	56	60	61	58
Age					
-18	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
18-25	59	51	52	54	54
26-35	27	32	32	31	31
36+	13	14	15	14	14
No Data	0	2	0	0	1
Ethnicity					
White/Caucasian	37%	28%	22%	31%	28%
Black	12	20	28	12	18
Hispanic	15	13	20	23	18
Asian/Pacific Islander	30	33	21	29	29
Native American	1	2	2	3	2
Other/Decline To State	4	4	7	4	5

*Two colleges required follow-up Operational Program Reviews in a subsequent year. Their data are included in the years in which the reviews took place but data from the first review have been deleted from the total. In addition, three colleges were unable to provide demographic data and are not included in yearly or cumulative totals.

Gender. The 22 EOPS programs reviewed during 1987-88 enrolled about 7500 students. (This includes an estimated 300 students from one college which did not actually report demographic information.) Individual EOPS programs ranged in size from 36 to 810 students. Women, many of them single parents, outnumbered men by a substantial margin (61% of the students were female, 39% male). This continues the pattern of larger percentages of female students than male students in EOPS (54% in 1984-85, 56% in 1985-86, and 60% in 1986-87).

Age. The greatest proportion (54%) of students were 18-25 years old. The next largest group was 26-35 year olds (31%). There was a notable proportion (14%) of students in the 36+ category as well. This distribution is consistent with that of the previous years.

Ethnicity. The largest proportion of EOPS students in the 1987-88 review were White (31%). This is larger than in the two previous years (28%, 22%). Asian/Pacific Islander students represented the next largest ethnic group (29%), an increase from the previous year. It should be emphasized that these patterns could be a function of the demographics of the individual colleges selected for OPRs this year, rather than a significant pattern in the ethnic composition of EOPS students statewide.

Blacks represented 12% of the 1987-88 OPR sample, and Hispanics constituted 23% of the group. Native Americans comprised 3% of the EOPS population, and 4% were either classified as "other" or had not indicated an ethnic affiliation.

Although Whites and Asians accounted for more than half of the EOPS population in the total 1987-88 sample programs, each major ethnic group predominated in at least one EOPS program. Whites were the most numerous group in nine of the programs, Blacks in two, Hispanics in three, and Asians in seven.

Educational Goals. About 6897 EOPS students completed an Educational Goals Survey as part of the OPR process in 1987-88. Table 3 indicates the largest proportion of student respondents, 53%, indicated that they intended to transfer to a four-year

institution. Thirty-one percent had vocational goals. A smaller group, 9%, reported that their principal goal was to acquire basic skills and 3% reported "other" or "undecided" goals. It is unclear how this distribution relates to data from the previous years since the percent of total students on whom goal data is available has differed substantially from year to year. (Data was provided on only 51% of the students in 1984-85 and 95% of the students in 1987-88).

TABLE 3

Student Educational Goals: 1984-85 Through 1987-88

	1984-85 (N=18 colleges)	1985-86 (N=29 colleges)	1986-87 (N=21 colleges)	1987-88 (N=21 colleges)	Cumulative Total (N=87 colleges)*
Total Students	3714	5090	6752	6897	22111
Educational Goals					
Vocational	24%	28%	21%	31%	26%
Basic Skills	13	19	15	9	14
Transfer	51	46	38	53	46
Undecided	11	6	21	5	11
Other	1	1	5	3	3

*Two colleges required follow-up Operational Program Reviews in a subsequent year. Their data are included in the years in which the reviews took place but data from the first review have been deleted from the total. In addition, five colleges were unable to provide the educational goals data and are not included in yearly or cumulative totals.

High School Graduation Status. Of the 22 colleges reviewed this year, all but one presented data on the students' high school graduation status (see Table 4). Of the EOPS students for whom data were reported, the majority, 76%, had earned a high school diploma, and an additional 8% had earned the equivalent of a diploma. However, at least 15% had not graduated from high school. These data are generally consistent with the pattern across all four years during which OPRs have been conducted.

TABLE 4

Student Academic Background: 1984-85 Through 1987-88

	1984-85 (N=17 colleges)	1985-86 (N=25 colleges)	1986-87 (N=20 colleges)	1987-88 (N=21 colleges)	Cumulative Total (N=81 colleges)*
Total Students	5425	4598	7057	6954	22689
H.S. Graduation Status					
H.S. Diploma	77%	74%	78%	76%	76%
Equivalent	11	12	8	8	10
Non-Graduate	13	14	14	15	15

*Two colleges required follow-up Operational Program Reviews in a subsequent year. Their data are included in the years in which the reviews took place but data from the first review have been deleted from the total. In addition, eleven colleges were unable to provide the academic background data and are not included in yearly or cumulative totals.

Appendix C contains an expanded table of the demographic information displayed in Tables 2, 3 and 4 broken down by individual colleges. A general profile of the EOPS student population at the 22 colleges under review emerges from this year's OPR data. These data may or may not be representative of the EOPS population statewide.

Chapter 2

EOPS SERVICES AND EXEMPLARY ACTIVITIES

This chapter presents a general survey of the structured services the OPR teams found in the programs reviewed during the 1987-88 academic year. These services are divided into the eight component categories of the annual EOPS plans: management services, outreach services, instructional development and instructional support, counseling services, transition services, special activities, financial aid, and staff development and training. The chapter also describes a characteristic of many programs that does not easily fit into the components listed above--the individual staff and program contributions that gave each program a personal touch and often were the key factor in making a program successful for an EOPS student. Because this summary is necessarily brief, it does not cover all of the strengths of every program reviewed in 1987-88. Only the most outstanding examples are included.

Management Services Component

Program management services fall under three general categories: program administration, program support, and program documentation and evaluation. Administration involves establishing and implementing operational policies, determining budget and service needs, preparing the annual program plan, selecting and supervising staff, and coordinating EOPS efforts with other college and community services. Program support includes public information activities and the work of a local EOPS Advisory Committee. Documentation functions involve recording the services provided to EOPS students and the effects of those services. The documentation also facilitates planning, program implementation, and accountability.

Half of the 22 EOPS programs reviewed in 1987-88 were managed by a full-time director or coordinator. In the other eleven programs reviewed, the directors held

dual roles. In addition to their responsibility for EOPS, these directors were in charge of the college's financial aid operation, or were dean-level managers with multiple responsibilities. One was also director of the college's multicultural program. In these cases, as one might expect, an EOPS program assistant, counselor, and/or secretary performed many of the daily administrative maintenance routines to supplement the director's role.

As one examines individual EOPS programs, it quickly becomes apparent that their management always involves much more than bureaucratic routine. The tone and emphasis of a program are most often established by the director. Although all programs provide a similar core of services, the director shapes the "personality" of EOPS at each college. As a result, slightly different service emphases prevail from one program to another. One program may emphasize outreach and recruitment activities, another may focus on the delivery of direct financial aid to students, and a third may give highest priority to academic counseling, tutoring, and basic skills development.

Those programs that the OPR teams found to be generally most effective had competent, well-organized directors who were respected by their staffs and others on the campus. These directors typically had a clear-cut vision of what they wanted their program to accomplish, transmitted that vision to their staffs, and had the administrative skills to help attain those goals.

Effective EOPS programs also had qualified staffs. Staff members knew their jobs, understood the organizational goals, and were dedicated to and experienced with EOPS-related activities. The most qualified EOPS staffs also maintained ties to the wider communities served by the program and had an explicit, vocal commitment to providing service to disadvantaged students.

Communication and information exchange was a hallmark of exemplary programs. In most cases, this information exchange took place within the context of

regular staff meetings, but more frequently, it was part of an on-going context in which regular discussion of program procedures and issues was encouraged.

Another hallmark of exceptional EOPS programs was a clear understanding of goals and responsibilities. In these instances, staff were aware of what the EOPS program was trying to accomplish and recognized their responsibilities attendant to those goals. The responsibilities had been appropriately delegated, so staff could act under their own initiative to enhance the program.

Effective EOPS programs also had activities that were well integrated within the program and were coordinated with other campus services. Coordination occurred in a number of ways. In some cases, intense personal involvement was the key. The director and other staff members communicated frequently and verified that services were mutually reinforcing. In other programs, coordination was more formally structured. For example, a professional counselor or peer advisor might be charged with monitoring students' attendance, counseling contacts, and use of tutoring services. Regular staff meetings appeared to play an important role in intra-program coordination. All EOPS programs, but particularly the very small ones, benefited greatly when EOPS activities were well-coordinated with other campus services. When EOPS directors were members of college administrative councils or faculty senates they could act as more visible program advocates. The best programs had the full understanding and support of the college administration.

A few programs used their Advisory Committees to excellent advantage as community advocates for EOPS and as policy advisors to guide program direction. The committees provided ready affiliations with groups which had access to potential EOPS students and assisted in extending EOPS advocacy within the college.

The extent and depth of documentation of EOPS services varied considerably among the programs under review. A number of programs, in accordance with newly established Title 5 regulations, had established thorough individualized files for each

EOPS student. These files included at minimum an EOPS application, an educational plan, and a mutual responsibility contract. More thorough files also included a financial award letter, a record of counseling and other contacts with EOPS staff, grade reports, and college-wide services the student had received. One aspect of exemplary programs was their use of computerized data systems which could be used not only for reporting to the state Chancellor's Office, but also used internally for program planning and evaluation.

Some exemplary management activities observed at EOPS programs reviewed this year are presented below in excerpts from college OPR reports:

Evergreen Valley College. The EOPS program is exceedingly well managed. The Director is aware of what is going on, who is responsible and what progress is being made. The staff has been kept very well informed, not only with respect to the variety of project activities but also on program guidelines and regulations--both present and pending.

The Director is innovative and alert to new opportunities to change and improve the program. Evidence of this is found in new program activities directed at strengthening the program, such as the improved academic progress monitoring and tutoring initiated this year and the proposed mentoring project. Program modifications in line with new Title 5 regulations are already in progress. The EOPS program maintains positive visibility on campus. This is no accident; the Director makes a concerted effort to ensure that college personnel are aware of the EOPS program and its activities through personal contact and through well devised, attractive and effective promotional materials. [Pat Salazar-Robbins, EOPS/Financial Aid Director, 3095 Yerba Buena Rd., San Jose, CA 95135, (408) 274-7900].

Santa Rosa Junior College. The management of the program is excellent. The Director has captured the intent and spirit of an EOPS program and has structured key program elements around them. The program is designed to serve the needs of local students and to fit into the institutional framework of Santa Rosa Junior College. There is also a conscientious effort to follow state guidelines and to anticipate changes in them. As might be expected in such a well managed and documented program, the team found no evidence of any compliance problems. The program plan is well considered and well written. Moreover, it is viewed as a working document that guides the activities of the program, yet it is also an evolving plan that changes in line with the changing needs of students and staff. EOPS has an active, involved Advisory Committee that is broadly representative of the campus and the community. [Maryanne Wood, EOPS Director, 1501 Mendocino Ave., Santa Rosa, CA 95401, (707) 527-4011].

Orange Coast College. A commendable area of the Orange Coast College EOPS program is documentation, in particular, the extent to which student data are stored on the computer. These computerized counseling records contain information such as: unit deficiency, progress monitoring, grants, counseling appointments, as well as other

information. [Richard Hernandez, Acting EOPS Director, 2701 Fairview Rd., P.O. Box 5005, Costa Mesa, CA 92628, (714) 432-0202].

Rio Hondo College. As part of the Region VIII special project, Rio Hondo's EOPS program has developed an impressive computerized data collection and data retrieval system. The Program Assistant and secretary efficiently, consistently, and thoroughly organize EOPS student files and maintain regular contact with EOPS students. They systematically use student academic data for counseling follow-through. The director maintains a computer-based system to monitor all EOPS student services delivered by each component and provides excellent coordination among the components. [Manuel Baca, EOPS/Financial Aid Director, 3600 Workman Mill Road, Whittier, CA 90608, (213) 692-0921].

Cañada College. The team was impressed with the extensive documentation and computerization of services that exist in the EOPS program at Cañada College. A knowledgeable, efficient, and creative Data Coordinator has developed forms for collecting information, and she maintains a computerized accounting of all activities. Data are used not only in generating required state reports but are used to enhance day-to-day operations. [Eila Turner Gray, Director, Special Programs and Services, 4200 Farm Hill Blvd., Redwood City, CA 94061, (415) 364-1212].

Palomar College. The EOPS Director is an aggressive advocate for the program at Palomar College. He and his staff dedicate long hours to developing and extending services which best address the students' most pressing problems. They have provided leadership to the campus through creative, active endeavors to extend EOPS services. For example, a federally funded (TRIO) transfer/transition program augments both EOPS and campus services, as does the EOPS initiated CARE/VEA program. Many activities originally sponsored by EOPS have been taken on by the college. For example, the college recently initiated a tutoring program based upon the EOPS model. An especially active Advisory Committee, composed of well selected community representatives, assists the program. All committee members complete specific assignments, while a few members take the initiative to create extra EOPS activities. [P.J. DeMaris, EOPS Director, 1140 West Mission Rd., San Marcos, CA 92069, (619) 744-1150].

Mendocino College. The EOPS Advisory Committee plays a strong role in the program. It is active, involved, and well-focused. Members are familiar with the plan, budget, and new regulations. They are fully aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the program and are concerned with structuring the very best program possible for EOPS students at the college. [Oscar DeHaro, EOPS/Financial Aid Director, P.O. Box 3000, Ukiah, CA 95482, (707) 468-3002].

Outreach Services Component

Every EOPS program reviewed this year maintains some level of outreach and recruitment effort in its local service areas as part of its overall goal of encouraging potentially eligible EOPS students who might not otherwise consider attending college. This effort sometimes includes early outreach to junior high school students.

While EOPS staffs usually made brief presentations to local high school senior classes in conjunction with overall college recruitment efforts, some EOPS representatives established special working relationships, and ongoing personal communication networks with local public schools in order to more directly recruit potential EOPS students.

Several EOPS recruitment activities also went beyond the high schools. In a few cases, EOPS made an effort to identify students already at the colleges who might be EOPS-eligible. In other cases, EOPS recruiters maintained an active presence at community agencies, parent organizations, and the like.

As a natural follow-through to outreach and recruitment, some EOPS programs provided orientation activities for students once they arrived at the college. A small number of programs provided a summer college readiness program--a program of skills assessment, developmental instruction, counseling, and personal/social development.

EOPS programs varied considerably in the sustained emphasis they placed on outreach and recruitment. In some cases, these functions were carried out by just one or two staff members over a short period of time. The director, an outreach staff person, an EOPS counselor, an interested peer advisor, or some combination constituted the recruitment and outreach staff. In other (though fewer) cases, recruitment was a year-long activity to which a large portion of the program's staff time was devoted. Finally, it was found that most EOPS programs did not fully assess the effectiveness of recruitment activities in terms of actual program or college enrollments.

A number of exemplary outreach and recruitment activities were identified in the 1987-88 OPRs:

Contra Costa College. The EOPS recruiter and the two student recruiters conduct an active year-round outreach effort. The EOPS recruiter accompanies college recruitment teams to all high schools in the college service area; in addition, he follows up these

visits with EOPS-specific recruitment at selected high schools in the area. The EOPS recruiters also actively recruit among local community agencies. This outreach effort includes contacts with all under-represented ethnic/racial groups. The Employment Development Department is a focus of attention with different peak periods--heavy emphasis during July and August (during which time student recruiters might spend 6 hours per day and as much as 4 days per week at the EDD office). Recruiters indicated that they had also pinpointed specific days of the week and dates in the month which were most effective at EDD. Social service agencies such as Manpower Service and Private Industry Council also obtain regular visits from the EOPS recruiters. EOPS recruiters also reported having spent time at community agencies such as: Martin Luther King Community Center, Shields Community Center, Easter Hill Community Center, and East Shore Community Center. At these facilities a desk or table is usually provided, fliers are distributed and an EOPS recruiter might attend meetings or make presentations. [Sodonia Wilson, Director of Special Programs and Services, 2600 Mission Bell Dr., San Pablo, CA 94806, (415) 235-7800].

Fullerton College. The EOPS program has established excellent working relations with counseling and administrative personnel in the local high schools. The staff has made a gargantuan effort to contact all high schools in the district except those in high income areas where there would be a low probability of finding potentially eligible EOPS students. The outreach staff meet individually with students as well as with groups of students. They also participate in college information nights, and cooperate with the college recruitment officer. As part of their training, recruiters use an excellent EOPS Outreach Services Manual. Other exemplary recruitment practices include high school field trips, which bring students to campus for about three hours; Leadership Conferences, Success Seminars, and Youth Conferences which draw potentially eligible high school student leaders to Fullerton to discuss contemporary topics. [Richard Ramirez, Dean, Student Support Services, 321 East Chapman Ave., Fullerton, CA 92634, (714) 992-7000].

Evergreen Valley College. The EOPS recruitment component at Evergreen Valley College is one of the very best in the state. It is systematic and well organized; it has appropriately targeted groups, procedures for making contacts, and well-defined staff responsibilities. Through EOPS recruitment efforts, weekly visits are made to seven "priority 1" high schools and monthly visits to fifteen other high schools. In addition, EOPS conducts recruitment activities in community agencies, including Department of Social Services offices and Food Stamp Centers. Recruitment is also conducted at other locations--such as shopping centers and community ethnic festivals. The effectiveness of recruitment efforts is enhanced by the quality of the personnel. Staff are committed, professional and enthusiastic. Moreover, there is constant attention to strategic selection, recruitment and utilization of new personnel. Staff have paid particular attention to devising a variety of recruitment materials to fit different contexts (posters for telephone poles, brochures for high schools and a modification for social service agencies, inserts for welfare check mailings, and public service announcements for radio and television). [Pat Salazar-Robbins, EOPS/Financial Aid Director, 3095 Yerba Buena Rd., San Jose, CA 95135, (408) 274-7900].

Cerritos College. For many years the EOPS program has provided exemplary outreach services to the local high schools and community agencies. A group of about eight uniquely qualified "outreach workers" are assigned to high schools with high proportions of potentially eligible EOPS students.The recruiters spend several hours per day for as many as four days per week in the schools contacting students through counselor and teacher referrals and classroom visits. Meetings with students are

frequent and individualized, and the outreach workers provide thorough information about Cerritos College and EOPS. Over the year, EOPS recruiters have maintained excellent rapport with the high school administrators, teachers, and counselors. In fact, in some schools, the recruiters are even given their own offices or permanent spaces within the Career Center. The outreach workers maintain excellent, thorough records of their contacts. No doubt, much of the success in attracting students to the college can be attributed to the recruiters' personal qualifications. The EOPS Assistant very carefully selects individuals who are positive, knowledgeable, mature, genuinely committed to the goals of EOPS and who have had some life experiences which allow them to understand the needs of EOPS students. The EOPS Assistant attempts to match those individuals with specific locations where they will probably be most effective. Following extensive training, the outreach workers attend regular staff meetings and thoroughly discuss their activities, sharing successes, failures and advice.

The Ride-Along program is a high point in the recruitment process. Outreach workers take groups of about eight or nine potentially eligible students on a tour of the campus. They view an introductory video, receive financial aid information and group counseling with an EOPS Counselor, visit the admissions office, the assessment center, the transfer center, and other important campus sites. They also begin college and financial aid applications. [Phil Rodriguez, Director of Student Affairs, 11110 East Alondra Blvd.,Norwalk, CA 90650, (213) 860-2451].

College of the Sequoias. The Summer Readiness Program was uniformly praised. For one month during the summer, 60 freshmen enroll for six units and receive a general orientation to the college and classes in reading, writing, math and study skills. They also benefit from priority counseling and early registration for fall semester classes. While attending the program, students receive a $300 stipend. EOPS staff and students attribute the success of the program to its two outstanding instructors. One EOPS staff member described the instructors as follows: They are two of the best faculty here. They have a manner which allows them to relate well to everyone. [Richard Grajeda, EOPS Director, 915 South Mooney Blvd., Visalia, CA 93277, (209) 733-2050].

Barstow College. For the past several years, EOPS has sponsored a summer readiness program for new EOPS students. These students are specifically recruited, selected and assessed for a six-week program. A carefully thought out set of English, reading, math and personal growth courses are taught during this six-week program. Broad, appropriate content is changed each year according to student needs and internal evaluation. Students receive regular college credit and earn a summer stipend. Almost all of the students who complete the summer readiness program enter college in the fall. [Barbara Hankerson, Director, Special Services, 2700 Barstow Rd., Barstow, CA 92311, (619) 252-2411].

Instructional Development and Services Component

Many EOPS-eligible students are not adequately prepared for college; consequently, they require extra assistance with their classes or with basic skills such as math and language. In response to these deficiencies, EOPS programs may offer direct instruction or instructional support such as tutoring in course work or in basic skills.

Occasionally, EOPS sponsors special classes to improve study skills and personal development.

Most colleges offer some form of tutoring to all of their students, and EOPS refers its students to these services. Most frequently, colleges hire peer tutors for minimum wages. This pay is not generally competitive with compensation available through off-campus employment; thus colleges who do well in this component usually put great effort forth in retaining competent tutors. In cases where the EOPS program pays a portion of the total costs of the college's tutoring services, Title 5 regulations call for additional tutoring services for EOPS students that are beyond the level normally provided to other students at the college. This "over and above" service may take the form of additional tutoring hours available only to EOPS students or special tracking or follow-through services provided to EOPS students alone. The OPR teams very frequently found some confusion about how the "over and above" criteria should apply to campus tutoring operations.

A few of the programs under review during the year had also developed special workshops in areas which extended beyond strictly academic concerns, such as parent-child relationships, job seeking, substance abuse control, building self-esteem, and budgeting limited resources while in school.

Some exemplary instructional development and instructional support activities were implemented by the following EOPS programs:

Cabrillo College. Two types of EOPS tutoring are available at Cabrillo College: "in-center" tutoring done on an appointment or drop-in basis in the Tutoring Center, and "in-class" tutoring done by teaching assistants specifically assigned to ESL, basic math and basic reading classes. The quality of tutoring in both settings is exemplary. The Tutorial Program Assistant uses a wide range of techniques and materials to train the individuals she carefully selects to be tutors. She has written an extensive handbook tutors may use as a guide. During workshops, tutors participate in role playing, work with EOPS staff, and discuss their expectations. Almost all tutors are bilingual and many of the tutoring materials have been translated into Spanish. EOPS students may request an additional hour of tutoring per week, and student progress is reported to the EOPS student advisors. [Luz Maria Ortega, EOPS Director, 6500 Soquel Dr., Aptos, CA 95003, (408) 479-6100].

West Valley College. Once each semester, at about the tenth week of instruction, the EOPS Learning Resources Coordinator distributes progress reports for each student. These are well received by the faculty, and about 75% are returned. Those who receive grades below a "C" are notified to come into the office to see a counselor. The Learning Resources Coordinator also uses the progress reports as a method of identifying potential tutors. EOPS provides individualized tutoring in the EOPS office, utilizing about 70 tutors in a wide variety of subject areas. EOPS allows more tutoring hours than the campus center, and there is substantially more follow-through on students progress. Most of the EOPS tutors are also working in the campus tutoring center and they are well trained through that program. The tutoring area in the EOPS office can be used for both individualized and group work. Students may use typewriters and two computers. A textbook center contains current texts, references and selected paperbacks commonly used in the English courses. Scholarship information and job prospects are also posted on a convenient bulletin board. The Learning Resources Coordinator has designed excellent record-keeping and evaluation methods. Tutors evaluate their tutees on a monthly basis, tutees evaluate their tutors, and everyone involved with the EOPS tutoring activities evaluates the program as a whole. [Carolyn Nash, EOPS Director, 14000 Fruitvale Ave., Saratoga, CA 95070, (408) 867-2200].

Los Angeles Valley College. EOPS tutoring is the only consistent individualized tutoring available to students at Los Angeles Valley College. The team learned that many students seek out EOPS specifically because of the tutoring. EOPS tutoring is comprehensive, flexible, and accessible to EOPS students. It was consistently mentioned by students in interviews and questionnaires as being of tremendous value. The EOPS Tutorial Manager is very highly regarded by students and tutors. She is dedicated, enthusiastic, and organized. She goes to great lengths to see that students' needs are being met. Tutoring is available in a wide range of subjects, tutors are well-trained and continually share ideas with each other, and tutoring times are accessible and flexible. [John Gipson, Assistant Dean, EOPS, 5800 Fulton Ave., Van Nuys, CA 91401, (818) 781-1200].

Counseling Services Component

One of the most important EOPS services is counseling and advisement, of which there are four major types: college information, academic planning, progress monitoring, and personal. (Career and vocational education counseling is discussed within component 500: Transfer/Transition). Preliminary EOPS intake and screening are also counseling responsibilities, as are the administration and interpretation of diagnostic and placement tests, and assistance with financial aid forms and other college documents.

New Title 5 regulations require that an EOPS student have at least three counseling contacts per term, two of which need be with a certificated counselor. In every EOPS program, students have access to a professional counselor. In most programs

reviewed last year, there was at least one certificated counselor who worked only with EOPS students. It was not unusual for EOPS programs to "share" one or several counselors with the regular counseling office. In one program reviewed in 1987-88 there was no professional counselor (or counselor equivalent) assigned to or closely associated with EOPS; this program's students were simply referred to the college counseling office for assistance.

Most of the EOPS programs also had a corps of peer advisors who acted as friends and helpers to their fellow students. The peer advisors often worked more closely with EOPS students than did any other EOPS personnel. They were a critical link between the students and the program. In addition to meeting with students on a regular basis, peers often performed clerical tasks required to monitor students' academic status. Peers received varying degrees of training in advisement techniques and in financial aid procedures, usually through workshops and regular staff meetings. In programs where structured training programs introduced peer advisors to their role, the peers voiced strong satisfaction with their work. Where training was minimal, they tended to report significantly less satisfaction with (and more confusion about) their own effectiveness as advisors.

In initial counseling contacts, students typically receive general information about college life and about participation in EOPS. This kind of information might be given by a financial aid representative, by a peer advisor, or by a counselor. Students are informed about program application forms and requirements, college deadlines, and college activities in which they might be interested and the location and functions of other services on campus.

Academic planning involves assisting students in mapping out an educational program, giving them information about transfer to four-year schools or to more specialized vocational institutions, and monitoring their academic progress. In this focused academic counseling, the counselor usually works individually with the student

to develop a short and long-term educational plan, i.e., an academic or vocational program of study which specifies the course requirements and the sequence in which the courses are to be completed. Usually, this academic planning involves at least one meeting each semester between the counselor and the student.

Academic monitoring is often the key to student retention. Sometimes such monitoring is informal--the student simply meets periodically with the counselor or with a peer advisor. More often, the monitoring is formal and involves checking units and grades throughout the semester as well as periodic written progress reports submitted by instructors to the EOPS office. On the basis of this monitoring, counselors or peer advisors tailor their own services to students and may also refer EOPS students to other college services such as a tutoring center, career counseling, or a learning center.

Personal counseling ranges from relatively informal student-staff discussion to professional crisis counseling for students who have serious personal, financial, or family problems. In many cases, the OPR teams noted that personal counseling was curtailed because the EOPS office facilities did not guarantee sufficient privacy.

Exemplary aspects of the counseling component were demonstrated by the following EOPS programs:

Orange Coast College. Counseling is the heart of the EOPS program and is recognized as the central service offered. EOPS students enjoy the services of the counselors. They find the counselors to be particularly warm and accessible. One counselor's Vietnamese background is quite an asset given the high Asian population enrolled in the EOPS program. The counselors keep thorough and careful documentation of their contacts and services for all EOPS students. They make a concerted effort to see students a minimum of three times per semester, in accordance with Title 5 regulations.

Students' academic progress is monitored by notices sent out to faculty during the semester. Prior to sending these notices, a personal note is sent to the faculty members notifying them of the coming progress monitoring for students. There appears to be a very good response to this effort.

Another commendable area of the EOPS program is computerized documentation which has led to efficient scheduling of counselor time, access to student records, and status and follow-up of recruitment and counseling services. [Richard Hernandez,

Acting EOPS Director, 2701 Fairview Rd., P.O. Box 5005, Costa Mesa, CA 92628, (714) 432-0202].

Santa Rosa Junior College. The EOPS counseling staff provide quality, consistent academic counseling and advisement for EOPS students. They demonstrate a sincere concern for students and for meeting student needs. Every EOPS student has a long-term Educational Plan describing courses to be taken on a semester-by-semester basis. Furthermore, the education plan is not a formality; the plans are reviewed and revised on a regular basis. The counselors also provide personal counseling and some transition assistance. Perhaps the most noteworthy aspect of the program is its focus on academic planning. This is evident by a copy of an educational plan in each student's folder; a plan which has been individually developed for the student and which undergoes necessary and appropriate modifications during the course of the student's work at the college. [Maryanne Wood, EOPS Director, 1501 Mendocino Ave., Santa Rosa, CA 95401, (707) 527-4011].

Taft College. The EOPS program has a very strong counseling component. The strengths lie in the skill, knowledge, sensitivity, and accessibility that the Director and the counseling aide have shown in working with students. Academic, personal, and transition areas are covered. The academic counseling is structured and organized. All students have an educational plan, reviewed regularly and changed according to a student's change in plans. The monthly progress reports tied to the release of EOPS grant checks allow review of a student's progress and the subsequent referral to appropriate resources such as tutoring.

Personal counseling is excellent. The moral support and encouragement given by the staff are essential in helping students to overcome problems and raise self-esteem.

Transfer counseling is provided to help students prepare for four-year colleges and universities. The field trips to other campuses have stimulated a lot of excitement and higher expectations. The most important vocational transition activity appears to be EOPS work-study that places students in jobs directly related to their majors and interests. [Bonnie Schmiege, EOPS Director, 29 Emmons Park Dr., Taft, CA 93268, (805) 763-4282]

Transition Services Component

When students are nearing completion of their community college programs, EOPS can offer activities designed to help them make a successful transition to four-year institutions, into employment, or into other post-college endeavors.

In the majority of the schools reviewed during 1987-88, some transition services were provided by EOPS counselors during the course of regular, one-to-one counseling sessions. Students interested in transferring to four-year institutions were given information about entrance requirements and course offerings, and a counselor or peer advisor was available to help students obtain and complete application forms. In some instances, EOPS personnel, acting on behalf of EOPS students who had applied for

transfer, maintained regular contact with officials from prospective receiving institutions.

Several EOPS programs organized field trips to local colleges and universities. The field trips motivated potential transfer students, allowing them to explore new environments while in the company of peers and familiar EOPS staff. Students were usually introduced to college administrators and representatives of special programs as part of the field experience.

The few employment transition activities in the EOPS programs under review were generally not as systematically organized as the transfer activities. Typically, information about careers and vocations was made available through career resource centers on the campus, to which students could be referred by EOPS staff. EOPS counselors and directors, for the most part, played a rather small role in providing information directly to individual students about employment opportunities. Instead, some EOPS programs administered interest inventories as part of the orientation process to help guide students' selection of career paths.

Generally, most EOPS programs did not have fully developed transition components--particularly with respect to transition to employment. The following colleges reviewed during the 1987-88 academic year exhibited strong transition activities:

Palomar College. The EOPS Director and an EOPS Counselor worked with the District to win federal funding (TRIO) for a transfer/transition program which serves the EOPS population. The counselor received referrals from the other EOPS counselors of students who are about to complete their college programs. He maintains systematic contact with these students, offering an array of personal-social, academic, and career assistance. Services this year included: competency testing workshops in English and math for students intending to transfer; campus visitations to nearby universities; participation in the UCSD EOPS Early Outreach Program to recruit and employ Palomar EOPS students in North County high schools; and development of a process by which low-income Palomar College students interested in Mexican culture/language would receive college credit and financial aid to attend the Morelia Institute in Mexico. The TRANSCEND staff worked cooperatively with the college Transfer Center on such projects as financial aid workshops, CSUC application workshops, the College Fair, and the Transfer Readiness Workshop offered by SDSU Outreach for EOPS students. EOPS also developed several tools to facilitate data collection for future planning. They designed an end-of-the-year

Student Services Questionnaire to evaluate delivery of specific services, and a mechanism involving the UCSD and SDSU Admissions offices to determine which Palomar EOPS students had actually transferred. [P.J. DeMaris, EOPS Director, 1140 West Mission Rd., San Marcos, CA 92069, (619) 744-1150].

Cabrillo College. Transition activities have been a main focus of EOPS this past year, with a part-time staff person monitoring the component. Some of the most effective activities included organized workshops and trips to four-year universities; weekly availability of a four-year university recruiter on the Cabrillo campus, with specific hours reserved for EOPS students; and direct contacts with personnel in transfer institutions and persistent follow-through on behalf of EOPS students. [Luz Maria Ortega, EOPS Director, 6500 Soquel Dr., Aptos, CA 95003, (408) 479-6100].

Special Activities Component

Occasionally, locally-determined needs cannot be met directly through any of the regular EOPS program components. Consultants are sometimes employed to perform special services such as staff training, instructional design, short-term audits, evaluations, or data analysis. Cooperative interagency efforts, such as CARE, also fall into this special category, as do EOPS-sponsored cultural activities on campus.

The CARE programs at Palomar, Barstow, Yuba, Cañada, Rio Hondo and Mendocino colleges were organized cooperatively among EOPS and local welfare and employment assistance agencies to serve AFDC parents who are also EOPS students. CARE projects, oriented to the needs of low-income single parents (usually young reentry women) typically provided assistance with child care payments, special counseling and personal development activities. Typically, the CARE program operated almost as a separate entity within EOPS. A special counselor usually administered the CARE project and reported to the EOPS director. Where EOPS peer advisors were single parents themselves, they were often assigned to work exclusively with CARE students.

As a part of the EOPS special activities component, some colleges also plan appropriate cultural and other activities for their students.

Several excellent special activities were in operation within programs reviewed during the past year:

College of the Sequoias. Two special projects heightened college and community awareness of EOPS during the past year and added to the program's positive image. Each semester, an Academic Achievement Ceremony recognizes EOPS students who have made the President's and the Dean's List for the semester. Ninety-two students were honored at the fall ceremony where students, families and friends filled the college cafeteria. A second event received positive attention throughout the community. The Cultural Fair, sponsored by EOPS in cooperation with college student activity organizations, was a unique day during which the entire college celebrated its cultural diversity through entertainment, special food booths, costumes, and informational presentations. The day was so successful that the City of Visalia requested to become involved in an expanded version this year, an event which promises to involve not only to the college, but the community as well. One faculty member described the Cultural Fair: A resounding success. One morning and afternoon of a cultural fair served more to improve public relations and an accepting college atmosphere than three public relations agents could have done in a year. [Richard Grajeda, EOPS Director, 915 South Mooney Blvd., Visalia, CA 93277, (209) 733-2050].

West Valley College. Each year, the West Valley EOPS program sponsors special events which draw general college and community attention and enhance the image of the program. Two such events served as excellent public relations vehicles for EOPS. An awards luncheon held in the spring honored EOPS students who had excellent academic records, those who had completed their Associate degrees, and those who planned to transfer. At the May, 1987 banquet, EOPS boaster of 49 students with grade point averages no lower than 3.5 and 32 students who would be transferring to prestigious four-year state universities. A second event sponsored by EOPS was a workshop on Indochinese Cultures presented for the college faculty and staff by the Bilingual Coordinator for the Santa Clara County Office of Education. [Carolyn Nash, EOPS Director, 14000 Fruitvale Ave., Saratoga, CA 95070, (408) 867-2200]

Financial Aid Component

Given the EOPS eligibility criteria, it is certainly no surprise that one of the purposes of EOPS is to offer students additional financial aid. Benefits are extended through direct grants, book stipends or loans, EOPS-funded work study, meal tickets, and other sources. In some cases, EOPS programs have elected to put all their direct aid resources into book grants and meal tickets--programs more directly administered by EOPS personnel.

EOPS eligibility determination and the efficient distribution of aid require close cooperation between the EOPS program and the financial aid office. Usually, specific personnel within the financial aid office determined and certified initial EOPS eligibility. The two offices then tended to cooperate in verifying students' continued eligibility for EOPS. The financial aid staff was often responsible for giving EOPS staff basic

training in the types of financial aid programs available for EOPS students and in how to help students complete financial aid forms. In five of the programs reviewed this year, the director of financial aid was also the EOPS director.

Most EOPS programs provided some level of financial aid orientation and/or counseling prior to eligibility determination. New Title 5 regulations emphasize that such an orientation be conducted. Typically, students were informed about the financial aid for which they might be eligible and were given assistance in completing the documentation necessary to determine EOPS eligibility. Much of this financial aid advisement took place before the student was actually enrolled in EOPS. It might have involved high school students planning to enroll in the community college and interested in financial aid. Other EOPS programs relied more heavily on the financial aid office for pre-eligibility information but provided some continuing financial aid information. Financial aid counseling was available throughout the year because many students had recurring questions and had to continue to demonstrate eligibility each term.

In contrast, there were a few EOPS programs that relied almost exclusively upon mechanisms established and operated by the financial aid office alone to generate the majority of the EOPS student enrollment. Students first applied for aid, knowing little if anything about EOPS, and were then referred to the EOPS office after preliminary eligibility determination was made. EOPS programs that operated along these lines generally maintained low visibility on campus and pursued relatively low-key recruitment and outreach activities. Unfortunately, it is the more assertive and resourceful student who tends to find his/her way to the EOPS office through the financial aid network, and passive EOPS involvement failed to encourage potentially eligible applicants.

The OPR teams found somewhat uneven implementation of new Title 5 regulations concerning financial aid procedures. Several colleges were not clearly awarding aid according to the purposes stated in Article 4 of the regulations, to "reduce potential

student loan indebtedness, or to reduce unmet financial need, after Pell grants and other state, federal or institutional financial aid has been awarded...." In addition, the new regulations emphasize that while the financial aid office shall award and distribute EOPS funds, the EOPS office is responsible for determining EOPS eligibility. In some instances, the EOPS director had delegated all of these functions to the financial aid office.

The question of how to determine whether or not a student was "maintaining academic progress" presented a problem for several schools, especially if there was a discrepancy between EOPS and financial aid standards.

Most colleges had relatively efficient procedures for distributing financial aid. What typified exemplary EOPS programs' involvement in financial aid were processes for systematic updates of financial aid information, rapid financial aid determination, prompt disbursement of EOPS grants, smoothly operating book grant or book loan activities, and well-understood distinctions between EOPS staff responsibilities and those of the financial aid staff.

Some of the most effective financial aid activities were evident in the following programs:

Cerritos College. Operations between the Financial Aid office and EOPS are efficient and well-coordinated. The educational plans required by Financial Aid are modeled upon those required by EOPS, transition to the eligibility requirements of new Title 5 regulations are being addressed, and the Financial Aid office automatically identifies eligible students and notifies the EOPS office about them. The financial aid orientation for EOPS students is also exemplary. The Work-in-Progress report required by Financial Aid is a potential tool for generating EOPS contacts. Furthermore, the appeals process established by the Financial office for students to bring their complaints to a board of judges has also been well used by EOPS students. [Phil Rodriguez, Director of Student Affairs, 11110 East Alondra Blvd.,Norwalk, CA 90650, (213) 860-2451].

West Valley College. The EOPS and Financial Aid office maintain cooperative and open communication. The directors of those programs have completed a unique Memorandum of Understanding which clearly outlines the expectations and responsibilities each holds for processing EOPS aid applications. All eligible students receive a $400 grant in a timely fashion; both offices have computer access to the appropriate financial aid information; the academic progress requirements of both programs are the same; and EOPS as

well as Financial Aid staff assist students with completing forms. [Carolyn Nash, EOPS Director, 14000 Fruitvale Ave., Saratoga, CA 95070, (408) 867-2200].

Yuba College. There is a noticeable spirit of cooperation between the Financial Aid staff and the EOPS staff, due primarily to the dual role of the Assistant Dean as both Financial Aid and EOPS Director. The Assistant Dean has conscientiously worked with both groups in joint training so that they all understand the functions of both programs. He has included the human factor within the context of financial aid guidelines and regulations. The Financial Aid office gives priority to the most needy students. The staff in the Financial Aid office demonstrate a sensitivity to student needs and go out of their way to resolve problems or obstacles for students. For example, this fall, some of the awards were delayed due to changes in policy and procedures within the Financial Aid office; therefore, they expeditiously provided emergency loan funds to EOPS students in order for them to meet expenses at the beginning of the semester. This type of effort is extremely positive for the college and for its image within the community. [Joe Cavazos, EOPS/Financial Aid Director, 2088 North Beale Rd., Marysville, CA 95901, (916) 741-6700].

Staff Development and Training

Staff development activities are designed to improve the skills, knowledge, and experience of EOPS and college staff and faculty. In most cases, this amounts to improving the technical competence of EOPS staff and the general levels of awareness of college staff and faculty about the purpose, functions and regulations guiding EOPS.

Various EOPS staff foster an awareness of EOPS on campus. On some campuses, EOPS representatives--peer advisors, the counselor, the EOPS director--visit faculty forums and individual classrooms to promote EOPS and its students.

OPR teams found that EOPS staff training was most often the responsibility of the EOPS director. Unfortunately, many programs were too understaffed to provide extensive initial training for new peer advisors, tutors, or other staff. Individuals simply learned their responsibilities on the job, under the tutelage of an experienced peer, tutor, secretary, or counselor. For programs to be most effective, comprehensive and recurrent training would be provided for all staff members, not simply for neophytes.

Typically, directors and counselors upgraded their knowledge and skills by attending local, regional, and state conferences. Training programs within colleges were

somewhat sporadic. Some EOPS student workers received training in classes for which they earned college credit. During 1987-88, some, but certainly not the majority of programs, had focused their staff development on changes required by new Title 5 regulations. Unfortunately, the OPR teams found many staffs still quite uninformed about the regulations.

The following staff development procedures are examples worthy of emulation by other EOPS programs:

Fullerton College. A professional Counseling Assistant takes responsibility for each specific part of the EOPS program. For example, one works directly with the financial aid process, another focuses on transfer activities, a third directs her attention toward outreach, and another attends to job placement and scholarship information. Every year or two, the assistants rotate job responsibilities so that all eventually are experienced in every aspect of the EOPS program. The student peer advisors are required to take a special course taught by the EOPS counselor. In addition, each shares an office with an assistant so that communication and mentor training is direct and immediate. Communication among the staff overall is excellent. Although staff specialize, they attempt to keep one another informed about projects. [Richard Ramirez, Dean, Student Support Services, 321 East Chapman Ave., Fullerton, CA 92634, (714) 992-7000].

Taft College. There is excellent, thorough training via weekly meetings and in-service for all staff. They are varied and well-focused. Results are evident in the excellent staff. Training includes implementation of EOPS policy, developing problem-solving techniques and practicing communication skills. Once each semester the EOPS Director coordinates additional inservice with the Director of Counseling and the Financial Aid Officer. [Bonnie Schmiege, EOPS Director, 29 Emmons Park Dr., Taft, CA 93268, (805) 763-4282].

The Personal Touch

The program components which encompass EOPS activities do not fully describe the essence of EOPS. Some aspects of EOPS do not neatly fit a budget category or planning component. By and large, these relate to human factors which enrich the program: the dedication, care, and attention that staff members give to students and that students offer to one another. The following student comments represent many that were made on OPR questionnaires or in interviews:

I could not have gone back to school if it wasn't for EOPS...I don't live with my parents and EOPS gave me some funds to go to school...they gave me a start. (Student at College of San Mateo)

EOPS has provided something which no other program has given me...love. (Student at Orange Coast College)

It is a program that helped me when I was lost at ELAC...[it helped me] to get money for books etc. It also provided me with counseling. And, it made me feel that there are other people like me at East L.A. College and that it made me feel like in a family. (Student at East Los Angeles College)

I was given the opportunity to meet many people [through EOPS], and I found out I am not alone when it comes to taking classes, filling out papers, etc. With help from EOPS, I found it much easier to talk to the people in administration and the social and financial services. For the first time, I wasn't intimidated. (Student at College of the Sequoias)

EOPS has made me realize that I can do anything I set my mind to do....They keep us alive. It's like a flame. You keep adding fuel so the flame won't go out. Same with us. You keep us motivated to succeed. (Student at College of the Sequoias)

I was never praised for anything before. This event (the Academic Achievement Ceremony) tells us that someone cares and is watching what we are doing. (Student at College of the Sequoias)

A friend of mine was here. He was forty and said well if I can do it so can you. I'm so excited. I'm charged up by the atmosphere. (Student at Santa Rosa Junior College)

[T]he most beneficial part of the EOPS program is the individual concern the staff has for you. They are always willing to help with any situation, whether it pertains to school or personal problems. (Student at West Valley College)

EOPS changed my life. I wasted twenty years of my life until I found Barstow College and the EOPS program...I now feel as if I'm going to make something out of myself...I want to teach here someday. (Student at Barstow College)

The biggest part of it is the encouragement. It's important for someone to back you up. (Student at Taft College)

They raise your self-esteem. Bonnie didn't give up on me and didn't let me give up on myself. (Student at Taft College)

I felt very alone when I started school. I was petrified. EOPS helped me feel welcomed. I couldn't have made it this far without them. (Student at Los Angeles Valley College)

I feel that the EOPS student advisor services works particularly well. I was assigned a student advisor who went into great detail to explain all that the program offers. This was very helpful because I was not aware of some of the things that the program offered. It was also a great way to be able to ask questions to a peer instead of an advisor since it was the beginning of school and I was still a bit shy around the faculty. (Student at Kings River College)

Amanda continuously provides motivation for me...she gives me pep talks, helps whenever there is a problem...she does everything. (Student at Vista College)

Chapter 3

SUMMARY OF THE 1987-88 OPR RECOMMENDATIONS

Operational Program Reviews serve two main purposes: to help improve individual EOPS programs and to identify general strengths and weaknesses across programs statewide. Those interested in OPR results would like to know not only about the unique features of a program, but also about characteristics which sites generally share. This chapter gives a summary of the recommendations OPR teams delivered to the 22 programs reviewed during 1987-88. The summary suggests typical weaknesses and does not describe idiosyncratic problems found in specific programs.

OPR teams base their recommendations upon how adequately program activities meet the objectives and criteria stated in the program plan and upon Title 5 requirements. During the course of a review, an OPR team does not compare one program with another. Each review is highly individualized. However, when the year's recommendations are taken as a whole, some generalizations can be made about areas which consistently require improvement.

To identify common features, all of the 176 recommendations produced during the year's 22 reviews were categorized according to the eight EOPS program components: management, outreach and recruitment, instructional development, counseling, transfer/transition, special activities, financial aid, and staff development. The component which drew most recommendations was management, with 71 suggestions. Outreach and recruitment activities prompted 21 recommendations, instruction required 21 recommendations, counseling required 33, transfer/transition activities drew no recommendations, special services required two, financial aid drew 18 recommendations, and staff development led to 10 recommendations.

Sheer numbers of recommendations should not be interpreted as an indication of how chronic a particular problem appears across programs. Some reviews resulted in very few suggestions, especially in programs where virtually all activities were of high quality and were in compliance with Title 5. On the other hand, a few OPRs identified numerous problems which added significantly to the total number of recommendations. The range of recommendations delivered to specific colleges was between 2 and 18. Moreover, the recommendations were certainly not all of the same weight. Even though the OPR teams tried to address only the most serious issues, some of their suggestions concerned relatively minor matters, such as obsolete items in an annual program plan, while others were extremely important recommendations, requiring almost complete restructuring of a program component or new staffing patterns. A set of recommendations delivered to an individual college usually consisted of interrelated suggestions.

The following sections, organized according to program components, outline consistent problems found in the 22 programs. Because of their importance, all recommendations which indicate lack of compliance with Title 5 are in a separate section, even though specific compliance recommendations could also fall within program component categories.

Management

About 40% of the recommendations concerned management issues. Including the compliance recommendations related to management, 71 specific suggestions addressed program administration, EOPS staff assignments and responsibilities, deficiencies in the program plans, coordination of EOPS with other college activities, and office accommodations. This number represents only half as many recommendations as were made in the same category during the prior year's OPRs. It should be pointed out that three programs had either none or only one very minor recommendation concerning management deficiencies.

Program Administration. This category includes a broad spectrum of activities pertaining to the administration and daily operation of EOPS programs. Eighteen of the 22 programs received at least one recommendation about general administration. Some problems surfaced as local programs adjusted to the new Title 5 requirement for colleges to provide 50% of the support for EOPS directors and 15% of the overall support for the EOPS program. Several colleges continue to place demands which draw EOPS director's time and attention away from EOPS-specific management. Within the 1987-88 sample, it was relatively rare to find an EOPS director who could spend the majority of his time administering the program. Serious problems resulting from a lack of a full-time management were identified in five programs. In these cases, directors found that significant blocks of their time would be diverted to non-EOPS matters, and daily management tasks either went undone or were assumed by other EOPS staff. This often created a lack of role clarity among those who assumed the duties but did not have the management authority.

Unlike past years, however, certification of EOPS directors was identified as a problem in only one college, and in only one other college was it suggested that the EOPS director position be raised to a management level. At the time the programs were reviewed, half were headed by full-time EOPS directors, at least five of whom were also the EOPS counselor, leaving about six directors who had exclusively management roles within EOPS. Eleven directors were half-time or less EOPS managers. Of these, five were also financial aid directors, five were deans responsible for several programs in addition to EOPS, and one was also a multicultural program director.

Only one recommendation suggested that the director improve coordination of EOPS services with other college services. Most programs reviewed in 1987-88 did at least an adequate if not an excellent job in this area. But, program administration problems were noted more frequently in several other areas. Some directors were having difficulties interpreting the new Title 5 regulations, resulting in many recom-

mendations about compliance. These are discussed in another section of this report. Deficiencies were commonly found in centralized student files which did not contain the required documentation. Four related recommendations stated that data collection procedures were inadequate. Several of these suggested improving EOPS use of computerization already available on campus. At least nine recommendations noted that EOPS staff who were assigned program administration duties were not performing EOPS-specific services, thus creating staff shortages. Most often these staff were those in clerical or student assistant positions.

Office Space. EOPS office space was not adequate in nine colleges. In most cases, counselors did not have confidential areas in which to work with students. A common recommendation was: "The EOPS Director should work with the college administration to develop a more adequate EOPS office area which would provide sufficient space for existing services, privacy to ensure confidentiality in counseling, and adequate storage."

Image and Campus Awareness. Six of the programs reviewed during 1987-88 received recommendations to improve the image and awareness of EOPS on campus. In its general form, such a recommendation might state, "The EOPS Director should make a concerted and ongoing effort to inform faculty and staff about EOPS philosophy, goals, and activities." The lack of campus awareness about EOPS was sometimes complicated by a negative image, that is, a misinterpretation of the EOPS functions or the constituency of the program. In a few cases, there was a generally held mistaken assumption that EOPS served only minority students or only students with academic deficiencies.

Occasionally, the team noted very idiosyncratic situations which led to fundamental misconceptions about EOPS. For example, in one case, the OPR team felt that EOPS had been so incorporated into another college activity that EOPS had almost lost its identity altogether. Perhaps even more seriously, at other colleges, the OPR team suggested that the EOPS program had not done an adequate job of communicating to it own eligible students the nature of the program and of its services. Recommendations

suggested actions that an EOPS staff could take to improve the program's image and to increase campus awareness of EOPS: develop promotional materials, publish a regular newsletter, present inservice programs for college faculty and staff.

Compliance with Title 5

OPR teams often detected discrepancies between program practices and the requirements of Title 5. The teams presented 68 recommendations which addressed situations out of compliance with Title 5, 12 more than had been presented in 1986-87. There were striking differences among the 22 programs under review in their levels of compliance. Two programs had no compliance problems, four programs required only one minor compliance recommendation apiece, while one college had eight compliance problems and another program drew seven recommendations.

During the fall of 1987-88, the long anticipated, new regulations were finally installed, and among the programs reviewed, the teams encountered a wide range in the level of implementation of these changes. Some had started adjusting to the changes several years earlier. OPR teams found new regulations well in place and operating fluidly at these sites. The majority of the programs reviewed had only recently begun to initiate changes, and staffs in these programs were only very generally informed about new regulations. At other sites, directors had done very little to inform their staffs or to implement changes. A myriad of recommendations dealt with applying the new, broader criteria for qualifying EOPS students, meeting the required number of counseling contacts, maintaining complete student files, and providing adequate college support for EOPS.

Compliance with the "Over and Above" Requirement. EOPS Title 5 regulations specify that a college may not charge EOPS for services to EOPS students that the college regularly and routinely provides to all other students of the institution. That is, EOPS funds may not be used to supplant regularly funded college programs. Services provided by EOPS must be "over and above" what is customarily available to all students. By far

the majority of compliance-related recommendations in 1987-88 cited situations which failed to meet state requirements for "over and above" services. Sixteen colleges had conditions which failed to meet the "over and above" standard. In most colleges, only one or two positions or activities were out of compliance on these grounds. A typical recommendation would state, "The EOPS Director should review the services provided by EOPS tutors and ensure that they provide services to EOPS students which are over and above those provided other college students or delete the tutor positions from the program plan." Fourteen recommendations identified a variety of other types of problems: five noted an absence of an advisory committee, four cited student files that did not contain required documentation, two dealt with the director's certification or district support, one indicated that students were improperly identified as EOPS eligible, and two programs funded ADA-generating special classes which were out of compliance with regulations because the instructors (usually EOPS staff) were paid solely by EOPS.

Because there were so many of these, and because the OPR teams take matters of compliance seriously, these recommendations warrant somewhat closer attention. In those colleges where EOPS programs funded college staff who did not provide clear over and above services to EOPS students, most problems occurred with the tutoring positions. EOPS student assistants, clerical staff, and counselors were also occasionally found to be providing some services to non-EOPS students. The extent of these services was usually quite limited.

Advisory Committee. Five program directors were instructed to create EOPS Advisory Committees according to the requirements of Title 5 or to improve the composition and /or function of existing committees. Some committees never met; others did not include a balanced representation of college and community interests.

Program Plan. Only five programs reviewed were given recommendations to improve their annual program plans. This number is considerably smaller than the 12

programs receiving similar recommendations in 1986-87. In general, there is strong indication that program plans are used to a greater extent by programs to guide their activities. This year's recommendations were of two types: those related to activities and those related to staff functions. In the first type, the review teams found that activities listed in the plan were either not implemented or that appropriate activities had been implemented but not described in the plan. The second type of recommendation was directed to programs in which the plan did not accurately describe duties which staff members performed. In most cases, the inaccuracies were relatively minor and the plans were fairly good descriptions of the programs the teams observed. However, in two colleges, the team found that the plans were inadequate guides to EOPS activities as they actually occurred. These plans required substantial rewriting.

Outreach and Recruitment

Sixteen programs received a total of 21 recommendations concerning outreach and recruitment activities in 1987-88. Ten programs were directed to develop or to improve recruitment plans. These EOPS programs either did not have a recruitment plan or were using practices which simply did not work. A typical recommendation was, "The EOPS program should develop a written recruitment plan that includes the identification of specific target populations, strategies for reaching potentially eligible students, a system for documenting individual contacts and appropriate follow-up procedures." Suggestions were made to six colleges to extend recruitment activities to a broader population, for example, to consider broader new eligibility criteria in recruiting among district high schools, potentially eligible adults, and specific ethnic or minority groups.

Instructional Development

Thirteen programs received recommendations directed toward EOPS instructional development. All but one of these identified a specific problem of compliance with Title

5; most often funding was provided for staff positions or for college classes which did not appropriately serve EOPS students.

Counseling

Recommendations were made for improvements in EOPS counseling in 16 colleges. A surprising number of these concerned problems of compliance with Title 5. Eleven referred to positions which did not provide "over and above" services to EOPS students, four programs did not require a sufficient number of meetings between the EOPS counselors and students, and four programs had incomplete student files.

It seemed that several programs simply had too few counselors. Eight recommendations suggested creating a full-time counselor position. In three cases, OPR teams felt that it was important to recommend improved training of peer advisors because the peers were either underutilized, performing routine clerical duties, or in a very few cases, they were being given counseling responsibilities which exceeded their training and experience.

Teams also noted in at least three cases that EOPS counselors would benefit from using computerization available to other counseling staff on campus.

Transition

No recommendations were made to improve transition activities. This is not, however, to say that the OPR teams found transition activities to be uniformly well developed and effective. On the contrary, transition was a frequently ignored component. College transfer centers often worked cooperatively with EOPS to provide transition services, and EOPS counselors offered individualized assistance to students interested in transferring or moving on to a job.

Special Activities

Only two recommendations were directed toward special activities, in part because very few programs sponsored special activities, so there was not much to review. One of the recommendations in this area related to the administration of a CARE

program. Child care is a continuing concern among the EOPS students, and CARE has been one of the few comprehensive responses to that concern. The second referred to EOPS contributing funding for a Mini Corp program which did not serve EOPS students in an "over and above" manner.

Financial Aid

Eight programs received recommendations to improve financial aid activities. Of the total 18 recommendations, four referred to positions or to book grant procedures out of compliance with Title 5. The remaining recommendations reflected teams' concerns about inefficient procedures for identifying, referring, and packaging grants for EOPS students. In two cases, the teams felt that the directors did not participate directly enough in EOPS eligibility determination.

Staff Development

In ten of the programs reviewed, OPR teams found deficiencies in staff development activities. The recommendations asked that formal inservice training activities be established for EOPS staff. Comprehensive and systematic training for all staff was called for in eight cases, while in one school, only the peer advisors were identified as in need of additional training. Positions filled by students have a high turnover rate, and the need for instituting systematic training procedures and for specifying role responsibilities for these students was typically recognized in staff development recommendations. Teams recommended staff development in several schools where staff were uninformed about new Title 5 regulations.

Few EOPS programs conducted systematic, on-going staff development for college faculty and staff. In those schools where faculty and general college staff were involved, EOPS tended to enjoy a positive image and benefited from direct referrals of potentially eligible EOPS students.

Appendix A

EOPS Programs Reviewed in 1987-88

EOPS Programs Reviewed in 1987-88

Region II

Mendocino College
Yuba College

Region III

Contra Costa College
Cañada College
College of San Mateo
Santa Rosa Junior College
Vista College

Region IV

Cabrillo College
Evergreen Valley College
West Valley College

Region V

Kings River Community College
College of the Sequoias

Region VI

Taft College

Region VII

East Los Angeles College
Los Angeles Valley College

Region VIII

Cerritos College
Fullerton College
Orange Coast College
Rio Hondo College
Irvine Valley College

Region IX

Barstow College

Region X

Palomar College

Appendix B

Operational Program Review Procedures

(Abbreviated)

OPERATIONAL PROGRAM REVIEW HANDBOOK

(FOR TEAM MEMBERS A, B, AND C)

This handbook will explain the purposes and procedures of the Operational Program Review (OPR). It is designed to familiarize OPR team members with the review process and insure that the site visits run smoothly and effectively. The handbook is divided into three parts: an overview of the OPR process; a description of the composition of the three-person OPR team and the general responsibilities of each team member; and a tentative schedule for the program review. In addition, there are supplemental sections for each team member; these describe the specific duties each will perform as a part of the OPR process, and contain samples of OPR forms and other relevant materials.

I: OVERVIEW

The Operational Program Review has two purposes:

1. To provide formative evaluation information to EOPS directors, and
2. To provide data for systemwide descriptions of the EOPS program.

To accomplish this, the review will examine program activities and accomplishments using the EOPS program application as a guide. Specifically, the OPR will address the questions: what has the program accomplished to date; what are the characteristics of EOPS students; what activities are currently being conducted and how do these compare with the program plan; and what recommendations might be made to improve program effectiveness?

The OPR will typically take three days. The OPR team will engage in a variety of activities including interviews with staff members and students, review of documents, direct observation of EOPS program activities, and informal discussions with individuals knowledgeable about the EOPS program.

The OPR results will be communicated in three ways:

1) A summary of team members' impressions and specific recommendations will be shared with the local program staff and college administrators at an exit interview.

2) A typed summary of findings and recommendations is sent to the college.

3) Subsequently, a full written report detailing findings and recommendations will be submitted to the individual college and an information copy will be sent to the CCC Chancellor's Office.

II: COMPOSITION AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE OPR TEAM

An Operational Program Review team is made up of three individuals.

Team Member A, who will function as the team leader, will be responsible for the qualitative review of EOPS activities and accomplishments. This individual will be an external evaluator/consultant with experience in naturalistic research. Relying primarily on questionnaires, observations and interviews, Team Member A will accumulate interview information that sheds light on the program's strengths and weaknesses. Team Member A will be responsible for preparing a narrative section for the final report. This team member will serve as team leader and will have responsibility for compiling the final report.

Team Member B will be an EOPS director from another college. Team Member C will be a representative from the Chancellor's Office. Team Members B and C will share responsibilities for the Program Activity Review which documents the implementation of EOPS program activities and accomplishments. They will divide the responsibility for interviewing staff and examining records to compare actual activities with the program plan.

While each of the team members has a slightly different responsibility, the success of the OPR depends upon close coordination and interaction among them. The team will meet regularly during the course of the site visit, including informal discussions during the day and formal, structured meetings in the morning or evening. Team

members have separate responsibilities, but their final product is a single assessment which embodies their combined insight into the EOPS program.

III: TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

Team members arrive the evening prior to the OPR and will have their initial team meeting that night. The first activities on campus the next day include an Informal Introduction of the team to the EOPS director and program staff, a Planning Meeting with the program director alone, and a general orientation to the college and the EOPS program. The remainder of the site visit is devoted to interviews, observations, and review of documents. There will be formal or informal meetings of the team interspersed as necessary. The exit interview takes place on the morning of the final day, and the OPR team returns home that evening.

FURTHER GUIDELINES
FOR **TEAM MEMBER A**

(Excerpted and Edited)

INTRODUCTION

These guidelines are to help you prepare for the OPR site visit and to give you some general directions for carrying out the evaluation of the EOPS program once on campus.

In your evaluation you will be focusing on the accomplishments of the program. Specifically you will want to inquire about:

(1) The way in which the program operates and whether this is "appropriate" given the needs of the target population, the available staff and monies, the time available, and similar considerations. Most of the questions about program operation should be directed to staff.

(2) The way in which individuals experience the program. In other words, what impact does the program have on its participants? Thus, most of these queries will be directed to students.

PREPARATION FOR THE OPR

Before arriving at the site you will receive by mail a copy of the official program plan and two sets of questionnaires filled out by faculty, staff and students (copies of these questionnaires are attached). You should use all three information sources to prepare for your on-site evaluation.

Program Plan

What to do:

*Read the program plan thoroughly to familiarize yourself with program goals and terminology (i.e., local names for generic programs).

*While reading the plan make brief notes of the kinds of activities which have been planned for each component (e.g., "Management", "Outreach", "Recruitment", etc.). Write short questions to yourself if part of the program, as described in the application, is unclear or if its intent is vague to you. Similarly, if some aspect of the program seems particularly interesting, unique, or well thought out, you should make note of this as well.

*Make sure that you read through the Table of Organization which will be included with the plan. Use this to help you identify who will be the best person (or staff position) to answer your questions about the different aspects of the program noted above. You will be able to set up interviews with these individuals at the morning session of the first day of the site visit.

Questionnaires

What to do:

*Divide the questionnaires into two piles: faculty/staff and students.

*Analyze the questionnaires as follows:

1) Faculty/Staff tally: Use Form C-1 (attached) and tally the number of faculty and college staff responding to the questionnaire in terms of their "primary area of responsibility." Do the same for EOPS staff. Then number (on the questionnaire) each respondent by subgroup (e.g., "Administration #1", "Administration #2", "Counseling #1', etc.).

2) Student tally: Use Form C-2 (attached) and tally the number of students responding to the questionnaire in terms of their "major area of study." Then number (on the questionnaire) each respondent by sub-group (e.g., "Biology #1", "Biology #2", "Business #1", etc.).

*For both the faculty/staff and the student tallies, please be sure to answer the questions (at the bottom of the forms) that have to do with how representative your groups of respondents are likely to be. The objective is to see how broad a range of viewpoints are contained in the questionnaires, and whether bias might result because one subgroup is under- or over-represented. If bias is suspected, you will want to make a point of soliciting other points of view when on campus.

Analysis of Questionnaire Responses

What to do:

*Read each questionnaire response carefully.

*Use Forms C-3 and C-4 (attached) to summarize the responses to the questionnaires.

*In the left-hand column of Forms C-3 and C-4 place respondents together by sub-group as determined prior to the OPR. (That is, try to keep all the counseling staff responses together, etc.) Enter the names of the respondents in the appropriate row of the grid if they have signed their questionnaire.

*Summarize each respondent's answer to all five questions in only a word or phrase and enter in the appropriate blank squares of the grid. (You may leave some squares empty if the respondent did not address the question.) It is helpful if you place an asterisk by comments that seem particularly interesting or potentially worthy of follow-up.

*When you have finished summarizing the responses read through all the grid entries. In doing this there are two things to look for:

-Patterns-

For example,

Do you find that most of the respondents answer a question in much the same way? In other words, is there unanimity in how all students experience a program activity or in the good or bad things all staff members say about how a program component works?

Are there differences in how subgroups of EOPS staff or students view an issue or component? Are EOPS staff, as an example, happy about a program component and students dissatisfied? Or, does one sub-group of staff say one thing about a component and a second sub-group yet another?

-Unique Items-

Responses which are unique because they describe an activity not mentioned elsewhere.

Responses which are unique because they offer a different perspective on some activity than has been mentioned by anyone else.

*Jot down any patterns or unique perspectives you have noticed.

*On the basis of your analyses of the questionnaires (and of the questions you have posed when you read the program application) make a list of the kinds of issues (activities, points of view) you wish to discuss with persons on site and a tentative list of staff and students who would seem best suited to answering your queries. If there are specific people to whom you would like to speak, coordinate this request with the local EOPS Director during the Planning Meeting the first morning of the site visit.

*Think about the questions you wish to raise in each of the interviews you will schedule. These interviews are meant to help you probe the issues you have identified as being important for program staff. You will want to focus on how they feel the program operates and whether it does so in appropriate ways. Typical questions might include: "Do you think you are reaching the potential EOPS population?"; "Have you developed the most suitable counseling (outreach, recruitment, etc.) strategy for your areas?" For <u>students</u> you are primarily interested in how they experience the program and what impact it seems to be having on their academic and personal lives. The following are typical questions: "How did you get into the EOPS program?"; "Would you have gone to college without the EOPS program?"; "Have you done better in school than you would have without EOPS?"; "How has the EOPS program helped you in college?"

REMINDER:

For the site visit you will have:

1) The program application (with its Table of Organization).

2) Two sets of questionnaires.

3) Forms C-1 and C-2 listing the subgroups of questionnaire respondents and how many of each responded.

4) Forms C-3 and C-4, analyzing the questionnaire responses for students and faculty/staff.

5) A list of the kinds of issues (activities, points of view) which you wish to raise while on site with a corresponding list of any program personnel or students you especially wish to interview.

DURING THE SITE VISIT

Team Meeting. The night before the site visit is scheduled to begin, the team typically will get together to meet each other, review the schedule for the site visit, and discuss individual responsibilities. You will run this meeting as well as supervise all of the activities during the site visit. This would also be an appropriate time to solicit any further background information which other team members may have about either the community college being visited or the EOPS program itself.

Informal Introduction. The EOPS director will schedule a coffee hour (30 minutes) to provide you and the team with an opportunity to meet the EOPS Staff and chat informally. This low-key introduction to the program will give the team an opportunity to establish friendly contact with members of the staff.

Planning Meeting. The first formal on site activity is a meeting between all three team members and the EOPS director. One purpose of this meeting is to determine which students and staff members should be interviewed by Team Members B and C to gather the information that is desired for their part of the OPR review. During this meeting, you as team leader will:

*Review the Site Visit Packet page by page with the EOPS director.

*Fill in the names on the Table of Organization.

*For each proposed EOPS activity, determine where the information can be obtained and whom should be interviewed.

*Work with Team Members B and C to develop an interview schedule for the rest of the site visit.

You (and/or Team Members B and C) will also:

*Review with the EOPS director the program's accomplishments for each component during the prior academic year.

*Review with the EOPS Director the demographic characteristics of currently enrolled EOPS students.

In terms of your qualitative evaluation role, you should use this phase of the OPR to do five things:

1) Get a first-hand overview of the EOPS program from its director. Team Member A should jot down any issues or questions which emerge from the Director's presentation regarding program activities, staff, community attitudes, and the like.

2) Discuss with the EOPS director the list of people to whom he sent the questionnaires. Assess with him/her just how representative the group of returned questionnaire might be of:

(a) the original group to whom questionnaires were sent, and
(b) the entire group of personnel and students who are connected with the EOPS program.

3) Coordinate with the EOPS director your own schedule of staff and faculty interviews from the questionnaire responses, so that these people will be available later during the site visit.

4) Meet with a program secretary or administrative assistant to arrange scheduling. This time should also be used to discuss informally with him/her general aspects of the EOPS program ("What's it like here?"; "How's it going?") as well as more particular things to be on the lookout for ("The students complain all the time about the counseling center.")

5) Obtain from the secretary a complete list of EOPS students that you have been scheduled to interview. Ask about the basis for selecting students and if there is a concern about representativeness make a selection of additional students from a full list of the college's EOPS students. In addition, there may be students that you want to interview based on their questionnaire responses. Ask the secretary to arrange these interviews for you.

Campus Orientation. All members of the site visit team will be given a tour of the campus. Use this opportunity to observe and to ask questions about the kind of students being served by the campus, any differences between EOPS students and others on campus, the reputation of the school and the EOPS program, housing for the EOPS program and other signs of administration support or disfavor, etc. In this informal question-asking you are really trying to get a "feel" for the campus and campus life. This will allow you to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the EOPS program in its larger administrative and collegiate context.

Gather and Record Data. Most of your time during the site visit will be taken up by staff and student interviews. Conducting these interviews will be your primary means of collecting the kind of qualitative data about the operation of the program and its impact which is so important for the final report.

Prior to conducting the interviews, remind yourself about the issues and activities you have identified as being important and why you want to talk with each of the scheduled interviewees. Take notes during your interviews and tape-record all those possible. If new topics arise during the course of these interviews which seem pertinent, arrange to talk to others about them.

Be sure to reconvene with Team Members B and C at least twice each day of the site visit to review your early findings and the progress of your efforts. Compare what you are learning with what the others are ascertaining. Changes in either the types of questions you are asking or in the categories of people you are interviewing may follow from this.

From the notes of your numerous interviews, your informal observations with program staff, and your observations on campus you should be able to start "filling in the blanks" to the questions and issues posed both before and during the site visit. That is, you should quite deliberately take your data and pair it with the list of issues (activities, points of view) jotted down earlier. In this way, the major foci of your evaluation and the resulting information will be placed together in one place. You can use this in your periodic updates of Team Members B and C, and for the purposes of writing your final report.

Preparing for the Exit Interview. After all data is collected, the whole OPR team will meet to compose a brief summary of findings and prepare formal recommendations for the exit interview.

Pre-Exit and Exit Interview. You, as Team Member A, will be responsible for discussing general findings and specific recommendations in both the pre-exit interview with the EOPS Director and the more formal exit Interview. Other team members may be called upon to comment on certain issues raised during their part of the evaluation.

FOLLOWING THE SITE VISIT

Executive Summary. You, as Team Member A, are responsible for compiling the general findings and recommendations reported at the exit interview into an executive summary. A typed copy of this executive report should be mailed to the college's EOPS director within one week of the end of the site visit.

Final Report. Remember: The purpose of your efforts in the qualitative report is to comment on the program's accomplishments. Specifically, you want to know--based on your observations and your interviews with staff and students--how the program is operating and how individuals experience it. In other terms, is it working "right", and is it making a difference in participants' lives? These may seem very elusive questions (as, indeed, they are), but if you have followed the steps discussed previously, you will have a great deal of material with which to answer these questions. Your task is not to come up with "facts and figures" about the program and its day-to-day operation, but rather to develop a sense of what the program is like for its participants. You must also recognize, however, that there may not be one way that the project "is" for its participants. People respond to the same set of circumstances in quite dissimilar ways. Part of what you must do is characterize any of these differing points of view, and give them a "voice" in the overall evaluation. When there is unanimity of feeling this, too, must be expressed.

For the final report you should use the following outline:

1) Orientation: This is a brief overview which describes the site and the EOPS facilities and staff. It provides the context for the more specific issues raised by your analysis of the EOPS program application, the questionnaires, and the interviews. This section should be not more than one or two pages.

2) Methods Used in the Qualitative Evaluation: You may wish to use the appended form for this section of the report. You will need to fill in the relevant information as called for.

3) Findings: In this section you will want to list and characterize any patterns you found in your earlier analysis of the questionnaires. You will also want to specify any unique aspects of the program. Program strengths and limitations as seen by participants are also important, as are any disagreements you uncovered. What are the prevalent attitudes and perceptions of program participants?

*Try to be specific. If all participants are excited by the orientation procedures that EOPS has developed, so state. Similarly, if staff feel that counseling services are not reaching the right population, this should be mentioned as well as any suggestions of why this might be the case.

*Use your main questions identified during the site visit as the major subheadings in this sections of the report.

*Use the interview and observation notes you have collected to frame a narrative which both summarizes those notes and addresses as thoroughly as possible the issues posed.

*Be sure to qualify your reports as necessary. For example, if your student interviews are almost exclusively with first-year students whose knowledge of the benefits of the program (you suspect) may necessarily be limited, be sure to so state.

*In your write-up, make an effort to use direct quotations from staff or students whom you interviewed, especially selecting quotations which epitomize a point of view or otherwise succinctly state what a number of people appear to be thinking. These citations should indicate the nature of the person making the comment (e.g., "a staff member") but should not name the individual.

*Above all, try to write objectively and fairly about what you have seen and been told.

FURTHER GUIDELINES
FOR **TEAM MEMBERS B & C**

(Excerpted and Edited)

INTRODUCTION

As a college EOPS administrator (Team Member B), you can offer specific program-related experience that none of the other team members may possess. As Team Member C, a representative of the Chancellor's Office, you have particular knowledge of EOPS regulations and guidelines. You will both share responsibilities for examining program activities, comparing actual program results with planned objectives, and developing recommendations for improving program activities in the future.

Most of your duties take place during the site visit, but some pre-visit planning is required as well.

PREPARATION FOR THE OPR

Approximately four weeks prior to the site visit, you will have opportunity to examine the Site Visit Packet and a "Guide to Using the OPR Site Visit Packet." Study them carefully. The Site Visit Packet will contain:

*A copy of the college's entire EOPS program plan.

*OPR forms for recording your observations and comments.

Read the program's activity descriptions and the output objectives and outcome objectives for each. You should be familiar with the program before you arrive on site.

DURING THE SITE VISIT

You (Team Members B and C) share responsibility for the structured Program Activity Review of the program's activities. Following a team meeting to review schedule and responsibilities, your on-site activities will include:

*Informal introduction to become acquainted with staff.

*Planning meeting with EOPS director to review program data and to determine interview sources.

*Campus orientation with a tour of campus and introduction to college administrators.

*Interviews with students and staff to gather and record data.

*Team meetings to prepare final recommendations.

*Exit interviews with EOPS director and college administrators.

Your duties with respect to each of these activities will be described in the next sections. Also, look at the site visit schedule that is included with the "OPR Handbook" to see how they fit together.

First, the EOPS director will have scheduled an informal introduction and coffee hour (30 minutes) to provide you and the team with an opportunity to meet the EOPS staff and chat informally. This causal introduction to the program will give the team an opportunity to establish friendly contact with members of the staff. It is important that all three of the team members be recognized by program personnel, and this is an efficient and non-threatening way to accomplish this goal.

The next activity is a planning meeting with the EOPS director. During this meeting the team and the director will review in detail the Student Population and Students by Component sections using Parts 1 and 2 of the OPR forms. (See "Guide to Using the OPR Site Visit Packet" for instruction on how to complete Parts 1 and 2.) The OPR team also will go through the program application with the director to determine interview sources for each program component and activity. Remember, your responsibility during the OPR is to determine if each activity/ function has been accomplished, so you will want to specify in this meeting which staff members to interview to obtain this information. For some objectives, the EOPS director will be the person who can provide you with the necessary information; for others, it may be other staff members, students, counselors, etc.

This part of the planning meeting might be conducted as follows:

*Describe your desire to interview those persons who have responsibility for, or are particularly knowledgeable about, the different activities.

*Review the Site Visit Packet page by page with the EOPS director.

*For each activity, determine where the information can be obtained and who would be the best person to discuss it with.

*Ask the Director to schedule interviews. (These arrangements might be made by the program secretary while the team is touring the campus.)

There is a lot of information to be obtained during the site visit, and careful scheduling will ensure that nothing is omitted. While you need not establish a rigid agenda for the entire site visit, it is better to schedule the important interviews in advance. This will ensure that all of the critical contacts are made.

After the planning meeting, the team should get together to assign interview tasks, dividing the responsibility between Team Members B and C. (Note: the first informational interview with EOPS director should be conducted by both Team Members B and C.)

The next activity is a general campus orientation. All three team members participate in the orientation activities together. These include a tour of the campus, an introduction to and a short interview with the college president, seeing the EOPS facilities, etc.

While Team Member A begins his/her qualitative review, Team Members B and C begin to gather and record data. They first conduct a formal interview with the EOPS

director. Using the Site Visit Packet as a guide, the Director will be asked to provide information about all of the topics on which he/she was earlier identified as the most appropriate informant. For example, the director will probably be the person who has the most information about the management component (100). Proceed through all program components discussing those items that are directly within the director's knowledge. (A more thorough description of how to gather these data and how to record information will be found in the step-by-step "Guide to Using the Site Visit Packet." Reviewing this document carefully before the site visit takes place will make the data-gathering forms easier to use.)

After the EOPS director interview has been completed, Team Members B and C continue to gather and record data by independently interviewing other staff members and students who have information about program activities. You should be compiling information about students, staff, program activities, and accomplishments. You should also be recording information that helps to explain your observations and your thinking about suggestions for improvement. The interviews provide information about discrepancies between proposed and actual levels of service and offer useful insights into the way services have been delivered.

Remember that your interviews and observations should also touch on two other OPR concerns: staff allocations and student services by program component. As you talk with EOPS staff, ask about how they divide their time among their different program responsibilities and about the number of students served by each program component (estimates or, if available, specific figures). This information will provide the substance of Parts 3 and 4 of your Site Visit Packet. (The completion of these forms is discussed in detail in "Guide to Using the OPR Site Visit Packet.")

Finally, a second interview with the EOPS director typically will be scheduled for Team Members B and C, for the late afternoon of the second day of the site visit (see Tentative Schedule). At this meeting you will complete any missing "pieces" of Part 4 (Staff Allocation). If time permits, you can also use this interview to discuss any other issues or concerns that have emerged in your interviews to that point.

Not all of the information that is necessary to complete the Site Visit Packet will be obtained from interviews. In addition to these, you will also examine records, review program documents, and observe program activities and services as appropriate.

As the site visit continues, there should be formal and informal team meetings to share impressions, make adjustments in plans, and discuss tentative recommendations. These may occur during the evening or at lunch or early in the afternoon. The purpose of such meetings is to compare impressions, determine if there are significant discrepancies in team member observations, and suggest areas for more intensive review. For example, if you discover a significant discrepancy between planned level of counseling and the actual number of hours of counseling services that were provided, this might suggest that Team Member A take a broader look at the counseling component. Such meetings are important. Sharing insights and concerns early on will allow team members to redirect their attention into areas that warrant further scrutiny.

After the team members have completed their individual activities, you will meet to prepare formal recommendations for the exit interview. During this meeting, Team Members B and C should review the Site Visit Packet, page by page, discussing the data gathered. Tentative recommendations will be compiled into a single final list by Team Member A. The team should also prepare a one to two page written summary of your

general impressions about the EOPS program. This brief narrative description will be included in the final OPR report, so all three team members should concur on what is included. It should summarize your general conclusions about the accomplishments of the program, its areas of weakness, and any special circumstances that are worthy of note. Listing positive characteristics is important since it serves to reinforce the strengths of the EOPS program and complements the specific recommendations for improvement. This list of recommendations will also be included in the final report.

The last activity during the site visit is the exit interview. (This is typically preceded by a pre-exit interview with the director.) At this time the team will share their general impressions and specific recommendations with the college president, the college administrator who supervises the EOPS director, the EOPS director him/herself, and other senior program staff at the director's discretion. You may be called on to offer comments on certain topic areas that were delegated to you at the planning meeting.

Form C-1: Faculty/ Staff Tally by "Primary Area of Responsibility"

Faculty and College Staff:

Primary Area of Responsibility	Number of Respondents*
Math/ Science	
English/Language	
Vocational Education	
Health/Physical Education	
Social Science	
Fine Arts	
Student Services	
Administration	
Other	

EOPS Staff:

Primary Area of Responsibility	Number of Respondents*
Tutoring	
Counseling	
Administration	
Outreach	
Other	

* Are there sub-groups of staff apparently not represented in the set of questionnaires you received?

____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", what sub-groups are not represented (or are under-represented)? _____

_____

Form C-2: Student Tally by "Major Area of Study"

Major Area of Study	Number of Respondents*

* Are there sub-groups of students apparently not represented in the set of questionnaires you received"

____ Yes ____ No

If "Yes", what sub-groups are not represented (or are under-represented)? _____

Form C-3: Grid for Analyzing Faculty/Staff Questionnaire Responses

Respondents	Question# 1 In what ways do you feel the EOPS project has been of greatest benefit to students?	2a Describe one part of the EOPS project here that you feel works well	2b Why do you think it's effective?	3a Describe one part of the EOPS project here that is in need of improvement.	3b Why do you think it needs to be improved?
P.A.R.:* _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					
P.A.R.: _____ Name: _____					

*P.A.R. = Primary Area of Responsibility

Form C-4: Grid for Analyzing Student Questionnaire Responses

Respondents	Question # 1 In what ways do you feel the EOPS project has been of greatest benefit to students?	2a Describe one part of the EOPS project here that you feel works particularly well.	2b Why do you think it's effective?	3a Describe one part of the EOPS project that is in need of improvement	3b Why do you think it needs to be improved?
M.A.S.* _____ Name: _____					
M.A.S. _____ Name _____					
M.A.S. _____ Name: _____					
M.A.S. _____ Name: _____					
M.A.S _____ Name: _____					
M.A.S. _____ Name: _____					
M.A.S. _____ Name: _____					

* M.A.S = Major Area of Study

Appendix C

Student Demographic Data, Educational Goals,
and High School Graduation Status
of the
1984-85, 1985-86, 1986-87 and 1987-88
EOPS Student Populations

Demographic Data
of the 1987-88 EOPS Student Population

		Gender		Age					Ethnicity					
	Total	Male	Female	-18	18-25	26-35	36+	No Data	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other/ Decline
College 73	383	141	242	0	224	116	43	0	72	33	90	116	10	62
College 74	266	129	137	0	175	73	18	0	98	20	22	124	0	2
College 75	560	294	266	1	336	137	86	0	18	29	63	446	4	0
College 76	810	311	499	8	381	299	122	0	394	59	159	92	65	41
College 77	548	223	325	4	206	220	118	0	276	62	38	140	16	16
College 78	391	105	286	6	173	139	73	0	256	35	55	20	13	12
College 79	106	50	56	0	64	31	11	0	60	29	6	9	1	1
College 80	423	214	209	16	212	144	51	0	144	66	51	128	14	20
College 81	243	57	186	0	78	108	57	0	4	56	47	130	3	3
College 82	332	137	195	1	226	76	29	0	79	29	203	9	5	7
College 83	217	60	157	0	89	94	34	0	44	79	66	26	2	0
College 84	187	98	89	0	122	55	10	0	22	4	25	132	0	4
College 85	174	98	76	2	112	39	21	0	64	13	30	63	0	4
College 86	60	21	39	0	34	17	9	0	18	9	6	21	2	4
College 87	227	67	160	2	93	87	45	0	126	13	67	12	5	4
College 88	193	39	154	5	52	88	48	0	160	3	9	0	21	0
College 89	424	133	291	6	195	146	77	0	59	215	38	91	4	17
College 90	398	213	185	1	273	103	21	0	66	4	23	296	1	8
College 91	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 92	692	267	425	0	479	135	78	0	223	53	311	51	15	39
College 93	36	11	25	0	12	14	10	0	14	13	6	3	0	0
College 94	558	174	384	4	378	98	78	0	8	14	332	170	4	30
Total	7228	2842	4386	56	3914	2219	1039	0	2205	838	1647	2079	185	274
%		39%	61%	1%	54%	31%	14%	0%	31%	12%	23%	29%	3%	4%

**College unable to provide data.

C-1

Demographic Data
of the 1986-87 EOPS Student Population

		Gender		Age					Ethnicity					
	Total	Male	Female	-18	18-25	26-35	36+	No Data	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other/ Decline
College 52	131	39	92	1	42	50	30	8	80	18	8	2	20	3
College 53	525	188	337	3	238	199	85	0	78	252	53	138	3	1
College 54	523	110	413	6	245	177	95	0	5	422	69	2	6	19
College 55	123	60	63	2	79	35	7	0	28	13	13	68	0	1
College 56	273	79	194	4	143	93	33	0	111	33	83	24	2	20
College 57	334	106	228	0	116	149	69	0	218	7	28	35	27	19
College 58	686	300	386	0	378	219	89	0	117	167	187	161	15	39
College 59	131	36	95	2	59	42	20	8	30	2	90	2	0	7
College 60	743	372	371	0	453	222	68	0	30	326	111	186	3	87
College 61	225	53	172	0	110	61	54	0	110	43	48	7	8	9
College 62	246	93	153	1	106	86	53	0	137	46	14	36	3	10
College 63	145	70	75	1	93	40	11	0	72	13	12	44	2	2
College 64	439	112	327	21	285	98	35	0	31	14	342	1	7	44
College 65	458	177	281	5	221	155	77	0	57	224	37	135	3	2
College 66	2123	1019	1104	5	1055	690	373	0	314	559	411	553	23	263
College 67	52	17	35	0	20	18	14	0	25	5	9	13	0	0
College 68	320	122	198	0	133	125	62	0	73	89	57	88	2	11
College 69	97	45	52	1	76	17	3	0	43	13	37	4	0	0
College 70	438	213	225	9	292	110	27	0	140	32	33	222	3	8
College 71	93	28	65	1	40	38	14	0	46	18	13	12	2	2
College 72	169	33	136	4	79	62	24	0	116	10	20	19	2	2
Total	8274	3272	5002	66	4263	2686	1243	16	1861	2306	1675	1752	131	549
%		40%	60%	1%	52%	32%	15%	0%	22%	28%	20%	21%	2%	7%

Demographic Data
of the 1985-86 EOPS Student Population

		Gender		Age					Ethnicity					
	Total	Male	Female	-18	18-25	26-35	36+	No Data	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other/ Decline
College 22	441	266	175	2	312	93	34	0	43	3	12	350	2	31
College 23	116	32	84	0	46	51	19	0	95	7	11	0	2	1
College 24	1212	544	668	11	568	413	200	20	415	142	235	368	22	30
College 25	229	91	138	0	110	52	26	41	26	122	11	14	0	56
College 26	154	69	85	0	102	34	18	0	27	39	35	33	2	18
College 27	215	117	98	0	138	47	30	0	61	73	33	42	1	5
College 28	115	35	80	2	62	41	10	0	52	12	14	32	5	0
College 29	125	45	80	9	50	40	26	0	110	12	3	0	0	0
College 30	176	49	127	0	86	60	30	0	53	77	19	22	2	3
College 31	326	141	185	0	192	100	34	0	68	89	73	90	1	5
College 32	479	183	296	0	195	203	81	0	9	285	22	162	0	1
College 33	365	149	216	6	202	112	45	0	49	165	9	123	3	16
College 34	315	161	154	4	148	119	44	0	220	12	5	28	47	3
College 35	666	290	376	0	403	92	50	121	97	104	91	321	1	52
College 36	50	20	30	0	12	17	21	0	4	5	26	5	3	7
College 37	189	62	127	1	64	88	34	2	153	1	11	15	6	3
College 38	431	246	185	0	224	151	56	0	30	19	23	346	2	11
College 39	49	11	38	0	18	18	13	0	41	1	5	2	0	0
College 40	628	348	280	15	309	230	74	0	64	91	69	386	9	9
College 41	24	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 42	33	15	18	0	26	5	2	0	12	1	3	15	0	2
College 43	125	27	98	0	49	56	20	0	75	11	29	4	4	2
College 44	131	33	98	0	98	29	4	0	30	12	89	0	0	0
College 45	21	9	12	0	11	6	4	0	14	1	1	3	0	2
College 46	54	17	37	1	15	21	17	0	7	10	30	6	0	1
College 47	105	51	54	2	79	18	6	0	53	10	20	20	1	1
College 48	434	196	238	2	217	152	63	0	105	161	19	144	1	4
College 49	420	176	244	11	176	161	72	0	158	71	83	96	2	10
College 50	162	40	122	3	95	47	17	0	56	30	39	15	2	20
College 51	182	79	103	2	71	59	50	0	134	17	6	13	11	1
Total	7948*	3502	4446	71	4078	2515	1100	184	2261	1583	1026	2655	129	294
%		44%	56%	1%	51%	32%	14%	2%	28%	20%	13%	33%	2%	4%

*College 41 reported only a total number of students. This number was not included in the total.
**College unable to provide data.

Demographic Data
of the 1984-85 EOPS Student Population

		Gender		Age					Ethnicity					
	Total	Male	Female	-18	18-25	26-35	36+	No Data	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Native American	Other/ Decline
College 1	539	238	301	14	325	136	62	2	40	321	40	123	6	9
College 2	221	91	130	0	128	65	28	0	109	22	7	78	3	2
College 3	170	45	125	1	77	62	30	0	100	33	14	10	6	7
College 4	670	352	318	0	433	165	72	0	143	124	61	231	11	100
College 5	74	31	43	0	22	25	27	0	39	1	7	15	2	10
College 6	111	68	43	0	40	48	23	0	55	4	11	37	4	0
College 7	460	228	232	5	285	126	44	0	133	25	57	237	4	4
College 8	331	181	150	3	251	52	25	0	173	33	16	81	4	24
College 9	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 10	312	169	143	0	209	78	25	0	104	16	19	140	0	33
College 11	1025	477	548	5	653	214	153	0	805	39	34	99	8	40
College 12	98	56	42	2	76	14	6	0	6	1	7	84	0	0
College 13	1084	477	607	30	568	330	156	0	434	43	206	347	22	32
College 14	290	126	164	1	198	62	29	0	66	42	145	35	2	0
College 15	276	112	164	1	102	130	42	1	37	11	192	17	17	2
College 16	274	147	127	8	124	92	50	0	19	27	52	160	3	13
College 17	541	294	247	25	474	38	4	0	38	18	27	444	2	12
College 18	492	224	268	1	267	175	49	0	189	37	192	64	9	1
College 19	100	25	75	0	37	33	29	1	64	11	5	10	5	5
College 20	210	54	156	1	81	92	36	0	85	60	31	21	4	9
College 21	258	61	197	0	67	121	70	0	182	27	42	4	1	2
Total	7536	3456	4080	97	4417	2058	960	4	2821	895	1165	2237	113	305
%		46%	54%	1%	59%	27%	13%	0%	37%	12%	15%	30%	1%	4%

**College unable to provide data.

Educational Goals
of the 1987-88 EOPS Student Population

	Total	Voc. Ed.	Basic Skills	Transfer	Un-decided	Other
College 73	383	177	55	150	1	0
College 74	266	40	0	192	25	9
College 75	560	263	0	297	0	0
College 76	806	253	106	411	30	6
College 77	548	219	30	268	13	18
College 78	186	60	29	78	13	6
College 79	106	32	16	58	0	0
College 80	423	77	7	273	40	26
College 81	231	164	41	3	23	0
College 82	332	99	12	202	0	19
College 83	217	99	25	91	0	2
College 84	187	18	9	145	14	1
College 85	174	56	1	111	6	0
College 86	60	16	3	37	4	0
College 87	227	59	25	141	0	2
College 88	193	69	10	95	13	6
College 89	303	58	62	170	13	0
College 90	409	10	11	347	39	2
College 91	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 92	692	169	139	274	98	12
College 93	36	4	0	26	6	0
College 94	558	194	16	265	18	65
Total	6897	2136	597	3634	356	174
%		31%	9%	53%	5%	3%

**College unable to provide data.

Educational Goals
of the 1986-87 EOPS Student Population

	Total	Voc. Ed.	Basic Skills	Transfer	Un-decided	Other
College 52	90	18	15	52	4	1
College 53	304	44	64	183	12	1
College 54	523	107	57	165	194	0
College 55	43	5	8	30	0	0
College 56	273	128	0	143	1	1
College 57	272	56	50	151	15	0
College 58	268	43	58	155	12	0
College 59	131	56	28	0	41	6
College 60	69	8	19	35	3	4
College 61	225	60	59	106	0	0
College 62	246	77	30	133	6	0
College 63	193	30	15	128	0	20
College 64	439	170	95	162	12	0
College 65	458	315	1	123	18	1
College 66	2123	45	430	390	1031	227
College 67	31	4	0	25	2	0
College 68	320	99	52	131	38	0
College 69	84	11	8	52	12	1
College 70	438	50	7	289	28	64
College 71	53	13	4	32	3	1
College 72	169	56	13	62	5	33
Total	6752	1395	1013	2547	1437	360
%		21%	15%	38%	21%	5%

C-7

Educational Goals of the 1985-86 EOPS Student Population

	Total	Voc. Ed.	Basic Skills	Transfer	Un-decided	Other
College 22	441	76	54	311	0	0
College 23	15	4	0	10	1	0
College 24	262	65	175	5	17	0
College 25	47	6	2	37	1	1
College 26	154	113	31	4	6	0
College27	154	6	14	132	2	0
College 28	11	3	2	6	0	0
College 29	76	9	13	45	6	3
College 30	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 31	172	35	28	103	4	2
College 32	479	138	95	210	34	2
College 33	349	91	0	181	61	16
College 34	312	221	10	78	3	0
College 35	133	15	31	84	3	0
College 36	44	10	6	19	9	0
College 37	183	38	4	131	10	0
College 38	431	47	140	232	11	1
College 39	49	11	0	32	0	6
College 40	628	273	178	82	77	18
College 41	11	1	2	7	1	0
College 42	33	8	3	20	2	0
College 43	125	55	7	60	3	0
College 44	131	40	20	71	0	0
College 45	15	2	0	13	0	0
College 46	52	9	12	31	0	0
College 47	105	4	27	74	0	0
College 48	83	17	16	49	1	0
College 49	256	56	36	144	18	2
College 50	157	42	33	74	6	2
College 51	182	22	46	102	12	0
Total	5090	1417	985	2347	288	53
%		28%	19%	46%	6%	1%

** College unable to provide data.

Educational Goals
of the 1984-85 EOPS Student Population

	Total	Voc. Ed.	Basic Skills	Transfer	Un-decided	Other
College 1	539	168	0	346	17	8
College 2	107	19	21	64	3	0
College 3	138	41	12	69	16	0
College 4	604	24	209	104	261	6
College 5	11	6	0	3	2	0
College 6	31	8	1	18	4	0
College 7	460	155	22	260	23	0
College 8	117	12	5	97	3	0
College 9	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 10	312	102	3	207	0	0
College 11	38	5	5	24	2	2
College 12	98	3	0	64	4	27
College 13	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 14	167	29	38	87	13	0
College 15	**	**	**	**	**	**
College 16	100	13	43	37	7	0
College 17	184	27	46	101	2	8
College 18	248	56	30	145	17	0
College 19	92	44	6	29	13	0
College 20	210	108	16	66	20	0
College 21	258	74	31	141	10	2
Total	3714	894	488	1862	417	53
%		24%	13%	50%	11%	1%

**College unable to provide data.

C-8

High School Graduation Status
of the 1987-88 EOPS Student Population

	Total	H.S. Diploma	Equivalent	Non-Graduate
College 73	383	283	65	35
College 74	229	196	0	33
College 75	552	415	0	137
College 76	804	614	86	104
College 77	548	375	35	138
College 78	373	247	51	75
College 79	106	64	16	26
College 80	412	329	31	52
College 81	231	148	27	56
College 82	332	275	27	30
College 83	217	138	34	45
College 84	161	134	11	16
College 85	173	143	10	20
College 86	57	47	7	3
College 87	223	155	28	40
College 88	192	138	28	26
College 89	394	324	8	62
College 90	371	325	27	19
College 91	**	**	**	**
College 92	691	590	50	51
College 93	36	27	6	3
College 94	469	341	25	103
Total	6954	5308	572	1074
%		76%	8%	15%

**College unable to provide data.

High School Graduation Status
of the 1986-87 EOPS Student Population

	Total	H.S. Diploma	Equivalent	Non-Graduate
College 52	119	70	23	26
College 53	333	333	**	**
College 54	523	368	56	99
College 55	121	120	1	0
College 56	273	196	40	37
College 57	324	272	9	43
College 58	680	508	57	115
College 59	114	55	10	49
College 60	**	**	**	**
College 61	222	186	17	19
College 62	246	182	42	22
College 63	193	172	0	21
College 64	439	300	44	95
College 65	457	305	53	99
College 66	1995	1623	152	220
College 67	52	45	4	3
College 68	313	200	43	70
College 69	97	80	7	10
College 70	350	308	21	21
College 71	53	42	3	8
College 72	153	126	11	16
Total	7057	5491	593	973
%		78%	8%	14%

**College unable to provide data.

High School Graduation Status
of the 1985-86 EOPS Student Population

	Total	H.S. Diploma	Equivalent	Non-Graduate
College 22	433	334	14	85
College 23	116	87	10	19
College 24	**	**	**	**
College 25	**	**	**	**
College 26	154	112	0	42
College27	202	200	2	0
College 28	12	10	2	0
College 29	81	54	18	9
College 30	176	121	27	28
College 31	116	78	17	21
College 32	330	203	127	0
College 33	265	235	14	16
College 34	307	225	50	32
College 35	**	**	**	**
College 36	50	40	7	3
College 37	189	135	26	28
College 38	431	340	21	70
College 39	49	37	3	9
College 40	599	384	81	134
College 41	**	**	**	**
College 42	**	**	**	**
College 43	120	78	28	14
College 44	131	103	14	14
College 45	21	20	1	0
College 46	54	40	5	9
College 47	105	93	8	4
College 48	88	57	6	25
College 49	256	175	30	51
College 50	132	109	21	2
College 51	181	130	20	31
Total	4598	3400	552	646
%		74%	12%	14%

**College unable to provide data.

High School Graduation Status
of the 1984-85 EOPS Student Population

	Total	H.S. Diploma	Equivalent	Non-Graduate
College 1	551	469	9	73
College 2	216	149	17	50
College 3	170	123	21	26
College 4	522	445	22	55
College 5	73	55	8	10
College 6	31	13	12	6
College 7	460	440	15	5
College 8	194	164	14	16
College 9	• •	• •	• •	• •
College 10	312	284	9	19
College 11	1012	796	130	86
College 12	86	82	0	4
College 13	• •	• •	• •	• •
College 14	259	174	19	66
College 15	• •	• •	• •	• •
College 16	• •	• •	• •	• •
College 17	540	199	199	142
College 18	484	354	37	93
College 19	78	67	11	0
College 20	204	154	26	24
College 21	233	194	26	13
Total	5425	4162	575	688
%		77%	11%	13%

C-12

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges NOV 11 1988